

**RECIDIVISM RATES FOR YOUTHS RELEASED IN
FISCAL YEAR 1997 BY
MAJOR PROGRAMS FOR ONE, TWO, AND THREE
YEARS AFTER RELEASE**

**LEGISLATIVE REPORT
February 2000**

***Kathleen Kennedy Townsend
Lt. Governor***

***Paris N. Glendening
Governor***

***Bishop L. Robinson
Acting Secretary***

RECIDIVISM RATES FOR YOUTHS RELEASED IN FISCAL YEAR 1997 BY MAJOR PROGRAMS FOR ONE, TWO, AND THREE YEARS AFTER RELEASE

**Prepared by
Lakshmi Iyengar, Ph.D.**

Acknowledgments and Technical Notes

Producing a research-intensive project of this magnitude was a significant, multi-agency effort. The Department of Juvenile Justice thanks the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services Secretary, Stuart O. Simms and his staff for providing much-needed criminal justice system data. Since breaking early patterns of criminality and preventing troubled youngsters from becoming adult criminals are major juvenile justice system goals, reviewing the extent to which serious juvenile offenders progress into the adult criminal justice system must be central to any significant analysis of juvenile justice recidivism.

All needed data for this report were obtained through the Department of Juvenile Justice's Information System on Youths Services (ISYS) and through Maryland's Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS). Although the data were closely scrutinized and analytical techniques were used to screen for erroneous cases, the potential for minor inaccuracies must be acknowledged, especially given ISYS's limitations. The Department has upgraded its information system this year and hopes to have better reporting system.

Additionally, ISYS and CJIS are not directly compatible, nor was ISYS originally designed to support such a complex research project. This made the data-gathering and analyses for this project both programmatically challenging and resource-intensive.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Table 1 The Most Serious Adjudicated Offense of 1,735 Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997.....	13
Table 2 Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 Within One, Two, and Three Years After Release.....	15
Table 3 Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System for Youths released from the Selected Eight Programs.....	17
Table 4 Recidivism Data - Summary Table: Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 by Program.....	19
Table 5 Recidivism Data - Summary Table: Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1994 by Program & Comparison of FY 1994 Rates with FY 1995 and FY 1997.....	20
Table 6 Average Cost Per Youth Released by Program Based on Fiscal Year 1997 Expenditures and Observed Average Length of Stay.....	22
Table 7 Program Costs Per Youth not Re-committed or Incarcerated: Cost Per Non-recidivist Youth FY 1994 to 1997.....	23
Table 8 The Most Serious Adjudicated Offenses of Youths Released from Youth Centers in FY 1997.....	25
Table 9 Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 within One, Two, & Three Years After Release: Youth Centers.....	27
Table 10 Comparison of Recidivism Rates between Fiscal Years 1994, 1995 & 1997: Youth Centers.....	28
Table 11 Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System: Youths Released from Youth Centers in FY 1997.....	29
Table 12 The Most Serious Adjudicated Offenses of Youths Released from Hickey Enhanced Program in FY 1997.....	31

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

	Page
Table 13	Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 within One, Two, & Three Years After Release: Hickey Enhanced Program 33
Table 14	Comparison of Recidivism Rates between Fiscal Years 1994, 1995 & 1997: Hickey Enhanced Program..... 34
Table 15	Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System: Youths Released from Hickey Enhanced Program in FY 1997..... 35
Table 16	The Most Serious Adjudicated Offenses of Youths Released from Hickey Impact Program in FY 1997..... 37
Table 17	Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 within One, Two, & Three Years After Release: Hickey Impact Program..... 39
Table 18	Comparison of Recidivism Rates between Fiscal Years 1994, 1995 & 1997: Hickey Impact Program..... 40
Table 19	Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System: Youths Released from Hickey Impact Program in FY 1997..... 41
Table 20	The Most Serious Adjudicated Offenses of Youths Released from Victor Cullen in FY 1997..... 43
Table 21	Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 within One, Two, & Three Years After Release: Victor Cullen..... 45
Table 22	Comparison of Recidivism Rates between Fiscal Years 1994, 1995 & 1997: Victor Cullen..... 46
Table 23	Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System: Youths Released from Victor Cullen in FY 1997..... 47
Table 24	The Most Serious Adjudicated Offenses of Youths Released from O' Farrell Program in FY 1997..... 49
Table 25	Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 within One, Two, & Three Years After Release: O' Farrell Program..... 51
Table 26	Comparison of Recidivism Rates between Fiscal Years 1994, 1995 & 1997: O' Farrell Program..... 52

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
Table 27 Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System: Youths Released from O' Farrell Program in FY 1997.....	53
Table 28 The Most Serious Adjudicated Offenses of Youths Released from Cheltenham Young Women's Program in FY 1997.....	55
Table 29 Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 within One, Two, & Three Years After Release: Cheltenham Young Women's Program.....	57
Table 30 Comparison of Recidivism Rates between Fiscal Years 1994, 1995 & 1997: Cheltenham Young Women's Program.....	58
Table 31 Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System: Youths Released from Cheltenham Young Women's Program in FY 1997.....	59
Table 32 The Most Serious Adjudicated Offenses of Youths Released from Good Shepherd Treatment Center in FY 1997.....	61
Table 33 Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 within One, Two, & Three Years After Release: Good Shepherd Treatment Center.....	63
Table 34 Comparison of Recidivism Rates between Fiscal Years 1995 & 1997 Good Shepherd Treatment Center.....	64
Table 35 Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System: Youths Released from Good Shepherd Treatment Center in FY 1997.....	65
Table 36 The Most Serious Adjudicated Offenses of Youths Released from Group Homes FY 1997.....	67
Table 37 Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 within One, Two, & Three Years After Release: Group Homes.....	69
Table 38 Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System: Youths Released from Group Homes in FY 1997.....	71

RECIDIVISM RATES FOR YOUTHS RELEASED IN FISCAL YEAR 1997 BY MAJOR PROGRAMS FOR ONE, TWO, AND THREE YEARS AFTER RELEASE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This report is the sixth recidivism document detailing the recidivism rates of Maryland's residential youth in juvenile and criminal justice systems. A primary goal of the Department of Juvenile Justice's recidivism studies is to assist the Department and the legislature in the assessment of program effectiveness and resource allocation.

The focus of this study is to examine the recidivism rates of youths released from eight major residential juvenile justice programs in Maryland during fiscal year 1997. Both the juvenile and criminal justice systems' recidivism rates are provided for one, two, and three years after each youth's fiscal year 1997 release. The third year after release information is only partial since the fiscal year 2,000 is not yet over. This report also compares the recidivism rates of youths released in fiscal years 1994 and 1995 to 1997 and provides some comparisons between Maryland's recidivism rates and a few other states.

In the past three years, the Department of Juvenile Justice has greatly expanded and improved its recidivism research. The Maryland General Assembly's 1996 Joint Chairmen's Report (JCR) guided the Department to develop and use indicators to measure the success of existing juvenile residential programs; to evaluate new programs using these measures; and to identify the most efficient and cost-effective programs. During the 1998 Maryland General Assembly session, a new methodology was recommended for conducting recidivism studies as set forth in the 1998 Joint Chairmen's Report. The 1998 JCR states in pertinent part:

"The recidivism data should show the percent of offenders re-referred, re-adjudicated, recommitted, and incarcerated. The releases should be tracked for one year, two years, and three years after release. The Department should develop this recidivism report in consultation with the Department of Legislative Services."

Thus, according to the JCR recommendations, this recidivism report is prepared in consultation with the Department of Legislative Services. The study includes youths released from the following eight programs in fiscal year 1997: (1) Youth Centers, (2) Hickey Enhanced, (3) Hickey Impact, (4) O'Farrell Center, (5) Victor Cullen, (6) Cheltenham Young Women, (7) Good Shepherd Center, and (8) Group Homes (excluding therapeutic group homes). These eight (8) programs were selected in part because they handle the most serious offenders and the Department's trend data shows that youths released from these programs account for the majority (62%) of the residential releases.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A total of 1,735 youths were released from the selected eight programs in fiscal year 1997, which represents about 62% of the youths released from juvenile justice residential facilities that year. However, it is important to keep in mind that these 1,735 youths represent only 4% of the total number of intake youths (40,713) received by intake

staff that year. This is because the majority (about 57%) of youths entering the juvenile justice system are one-time only offenders, who do not require residential care.

The population characteristics and recidivism rates for the 1,735 youths released in fiscal year 1997 are as follows:

Population Characteristics

- The youths averaged 17 years at the time of release; 13.1 years of age at the time of their first referral to the Department of Juvenile Justice; and they had an average of 7.5 referrals when placed in one of the programs under study.
- The average number of felony and misdemeanor referrals were 3.1 and 4.4, respectively. The average number of violent referrals was 0.3.
- Almost 94% of the youths had at least one prior delinquency adjudication and the average age at the time of adjudication was 14.6.
- About 98% had been detained prior to their placement and the average age at the time of first detention was 15.0.
- About 67% had at least one prior residential placement and the average age at the time of first placement was 15.5.
- Approximately 65% had been placed on probation at least once and the average age at the time of first complaint which led to probation was 14.6.
- About 67% of the youths were African-American; 29% were Caucasian; 3% were Hispanic; and 2% were Asian, Native-American or biracial.
- The 1,735 youths' most serious adjudicated offenses were felonious assault and robbery with a deadly weapon (37%), narcotics felony (22%), auto theft (12%), serious property felony (8%) and violent person-to-person offenses (7%).

RECIDIVISM RATES

The juvenile justice community has not reached a consensus on how best to define recidivism with one measure. Therefore, consistent with other studies, this study focuses on the following nine measures of recidivism, including subsequent juvenile and/or criminal involvement of youths released from DJJ's major commitment programs. The **nine recidivism measures** are: re-referral, re-adjudication, and re-commitment to the juvenile justice system, criminal referral, conviction, and incarceration in the criminal justice system, and juvenile/criminal referral, adjudication/conviction and re-commitment/incarceration in the juvenile/criminal justice system.

In this study, the 1,735 Youths are tracked in both the juvenile and criminal justice systems till October 30, 1999, therefore, the third-year follow-up ranges from 28 to 36 months. Any follow up after 24 months to 36 months from the date of release of each youth is grouped under third year after release category. Given below are the recidivism rates for one, two and three years after release.

Juvenile Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 1,735 youths released in FY 1997, 50% or 866 youths were **re-referred** to the Department; 24% (421) were **re-adjudicated** delinquent; and 17% (291) were **re-committed** to the Department's custody.
- About 43% (746 youths) were re-referred during **the first year** after release, 6% (107 youths) were re-referred during the **second year** after release, and only 1% (13 youths) were re-referred during the **third year** after release.

Criminal Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 1,735 youths released in FY 1997, 53% (913) were **referred** to the criminal justice system at least once; 44% (765) were **convicted** of a criminal offense; and 30% (519) were **incarcerated**.
- About 26% (457) were referred to the criminal justice system within **the first year** after release, 18% (307) were referred during the **second year** after release, and 9% (149) were referred during the **third year** after release.
- Approximately 51% of the youths with criminal justice referrals had also been re-referred to the juvenile justice system at least once.

Juvenile and Criminal Justice Recidivism Combined

- Of the total 1,735 youths, 76% (1,315) have had **subsequent contact** with either the juvenile justice system, the criminal justice system or both.
- About 47% (808) have been either **re-adjudicated** delinquent, convicted as adults, or both.
- About 32% (563) have been either **recommitted** to the Department of Juvenile Justice, incarcerated as adults, or both.
- About 59% (1,024) were referred to either the juvenile justice system or the criminal justice system within **one year** after release, 13% (228) during the **second year** after release, and 4% (63) during the **third year** after release.

- Of the 1,735 youths, 24% (420) have **not reappeared** in either Maryland's juvenile or criminal justice systems within three years after release.

The following table shows some recidivism rate reductions between 1994 and 1995 and 1997 releases from the major six programs (Youth Centers, Hickey Enhanced, Hickey Impact, Victor Cullen, O'Farrell, and Cheltenham Young Women). All six programs studied in the Department's January 1997 and 1998 recidivism reports now show reduced rates for most, if not all measures for youths released in fiscal year 1997. This is evident from the following table, which compares the recidivism rates of youths released in fiscal year 1994 and 1995 to youths released in fiscal year 1997. The excluded programs are Good Shepherd and Group homes, because these programs were not studied for fiscal year 1994 releases.

Comparison of Recidivism Rates between Fiscal Years 1994, 1995, & 1997

Recidivism Measures	FY 1994 N = 947	FY 1995 N = 1202	FY 1997 N = 1536	% Change 94 to 97	% Change 95 to 97
Re-referral - Juvenile	55%	50%	51%	- 4%	+ 1%
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	22%	23%	25%	+ 3%	+ 2%
Re-commitment - Juvenile	15%	13%	17%	+ 2%	+ 4%
Criminal Referral	61%	61%	55%	- 6%	- 6%
Criminal Conviction	43%	55%	47%	+ 4%	- 8%
Criminal Incarceration	35%	43%	32%	- 3%	- 11%
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	82%	79%	78%	- 4%	- 1%
Re-adjudication/Conviction	58%	49%	48%	- 10%	- 1%
Re-commitment/Incarceration	46%	34%	34%	- 12%	0%

Note: In the FY 1994 report, the total follow-up time was 36 months and it was not 36 months follow-up for each youth from his date of release. Therefore, this methodology was different from 1995 and 19 97 releases study. Yet the recidivism rates were higher in FY 1994 than in FY 1995 or FY 1997.

These findings indicate that it is rare for any program to eliminate a youth's future contact with the juvenile or adult criminal justice systems. Despite this unfortunate reality, **66% of the youths released from the six major programs in FY 1997 were not again placed in either a juvenile or correctional facility.** This is especially significant given that these youths had an average of 7.5 juvenile justice referrals when placed in the Department's custody.

Given this difficult, multi-offending population, the relatively low numbers of youths subsequently committed to juvenile or criminal justice facilities suggest that **residential juvenile justice programs generally release less risky offenders than they accept.**

IMPLICATIONS

- Because most of the programs studied were serving serious, chronic and violent offenders, 2 out of 3 youths studied were already recidivists at the time of their release in fiscal year 1997. About 94% had at least one prior delinquency adjudication, and 98% had been detained at least once prior to their residential placement.
- A review of this population's racial dynamics reflects the Department's ongoing concerns about the disproportionate representation of African-American males in the juvenile justice system.
- While the majority of these serious juvenile offenders (78%) have had subsequent contact with either juvenile or criminal justice systems, only 34% required subsequent residential placements in either system. Thus, the majority of recidivist youths seem to have returned for less serious charge, signifying the juvenile justice system's public safety and fiscal benefits.

SUMMARY AND FOLLOW-UP PLANS

This study reveals that the majority of youths were recidivists in the juvenile justice system within one year after release and in the criminal justice system within two years after release. However, only 34% required subsequent residential placements in either system. The 1,735 youths studied in this report represent only 4% of the total number of intake youths received by the Department in fiscal year 1997. Over half the Department's residential care budget is devoted to funding the selected public or privately operated residential programs. The majority (57%) of youths entering the juvenile justice system are one-time only offenders to intake, who do not require residential care. This supports current Departmental efforts to increase sanctions for second and third-time juvenile offenders.

Additionally, the Department of Juvenile Justice is planning to incorporate accountability measures, including recidivism into all contracts and grant applications. The Department's emphasis on recidivism research and program evaluation will result in future reports analyzing the recidivism rates as youths progress through the juvenile justice system from intake to juvenile court probation, to detention, and to committed residential programs.

This page is intentionally blank

RECIDIVISM RATES FOR YOUTHS RELEASED IN FISCAL YEAR 1997 BY MAJOR PROGRAMS FOR ONE, TWO, AND THREE YEARS AFTER RELEASE

INTRODUCTION

As part of its comprehensive strategy to handle increasingly serious offenders while reducing recidivism rates, the Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) has expanded and improved its recidivism research. A primary goal of the Department's recidivism studies is to assist the Department and the legislature in the assessment of program effectiveness and resource allocation.

With guidance from the Maryland legislature, the Department of Juvenile Justice has been expanding its recidivism studies each year. During the 1998 Maryland General Assembly session, the Joint Chairmen's Report (JCR) recommended a new methodology for conducting recidivism studies. The 1998 Joint Chairmen's Report states:

"The recidivism data should show the percent of offenders re-referred, re-adjudicated, recommitted, and incarcerated. The releases should be tracked for one year, two years, and three years after release. The Department should develop this recidivism report in consultation with the Department of Legislative Services."

Based on this new methodology, this report is submitted to the Maryland legislature in February 2000, in coordination with the fiscal year 2001 budget bill. The report includes a detailed **statewide and program by program review of the recidivism rates** at one, two, and three years after release in the **juvenile and criminal justice systems**. Details included are demographic characteristics, prior histories of referrals and placements, the most serious adjudicated offense, the average number of referrals for violent, felony and misdemeanors. The summary tables include program-by-program recidivism rates after each year of follow-up period. Although the majority of youths recidivate within one year after release in the juvenile justice system and within two years after release in the criminal justice system, it should be noted that the third-year follow-up ranges from 4 months to 12 months.

In consultation with the Department of Legislative Services, the Department of Juvenile Justice chose the fiscal year 1997 releases for this study to make comparisons between fiscal years 1994 and 1995 releases. This study examines the recidivism rates of youths released from eight major residential juvenile justice programs in Maryland during fiscal year 1997. Both the juvenile and criminal justice systems' recidivism rates are provided for one, two, and three years after each youth's fiscal year 1997 release. Fiscal year 1997 spans from July 1, 1996 through June 30, 1997. This report also provides some comparisons between Maryland's recidivism rates and a few other states.

RECIDIVISM REPORTS HISTORY

In the past three years, the Department of Juvenile Justice has greatly expanded and improved its recidivism research. The Maryland General Assembly's 1996 Joint Chairmen's Report (JCR) guided the Department to develop and use indicators to measure the success of existing juvenile residential programs, to evaluate new programs using these measures and to identify the most efficient and cost-effective programs. The Department, in response to the 1996 JCR, prepared the following five recidivism and evaluation reports:

1. **Juvenile Justice and Recidivism Prevention**, August 15, 1996 - detailed the history of the Department's recidivism definitions and data use; outlined plans for measuring recidivism rates at six major residential programs; provided preliminary recidivism rate estimates; and explained long-term plans for a comprehensive system-wide study tracking all youths born in 1977 as they are processed in the juvenile justice system.
2. **Maryland Department of Juvenile Justice Recidivism Analyses: A Program-by-Program Review of Recidivism Measures at Major Residential Facilities for Department of Juvenile Justice Youths**, January 1, 1997 - studied 947 youths released from six major residential programs during *fiscal year 1994*; examined recidivism rates and cost effectiveness indicators for each of these six major programs; and found that although most youths had subsequent contact with the juvenile or criminal justice systems, the majority (54%) were not again committed to the Department's custody or incarcerated as adults.
3. **Maryland Department of Juvenile Justice Recidivism Analyses: A Program by Program Review of Recidivism Measures at Major Residential Facilities Releasing Department of Juvenile Justice Youths in 1995**, July 1, 1997 - studied 1,334 youths released from seven major residential programs in *calendar year 1995*; examined recidivism rates and cost effectiveness indicators for each of these seven major programs; and identified a reduction in the combined re-commitment and/or incarceration recidivism rate.
4. **A Review of Recidivism Rates Among All Juvenile Justice Youths Born in 1977**, February 2, 1998 - examined 20,053 youths as they were processed through the juvenile justice system, i.e., from intake to probation, to detention, to committed residential programs; found that 56% of youths never returned to the juvenile justice system after their first intake counseling session, and only 8% of the total 20,053 youths were committed for placement in residential programs. The re-referral, re-adjudication and re-commitment juvenile recidivism rates for this first commitment group were 43%, 23%, and 15%, respectively.

5. ***Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1995 by Major Programs for One, Two, and Three Years After Release, February 9, 1999*** - studied 1,270 youths released from nine major residential programs in *fiscal year 1995*; examined recidivism rates and cost effectiveness indicators for each of these nine major programs; and identified a reduction in the combined re-commitment and/or incarceration recidivism rate.

RECIDIVISM METHODOLOGY

The 1998 Joint Chairmen's Report states that "the recidivism data should show the percent of offenders re-referred, re-adjudicated, recommitted, and incarcerated. The releases should be tracked for one year, two years, and three years after release. The Department should develop this recidivism report in consultation with the Department of Legislative Services."

According to the JCR, this study tracked youths at multiple fixed periods, i.e., one, two, and three years after release (Note: the third year releases are not complete for all youths, since the fiscal 2,000 is not over).

RECIDIVISM DEFINITION

The juvenile justice community has not reached a consensus on how best to define recidivism with one measure. Therefore, consistent with other studies, this study has focused on several measures, including subsequent juvenile and/or criminal involvement of youths released from DJJ's major commitment programs. The majority of youths released from DJJ's major residential programs are 17 years old. Therefore, it is important to track these youths in the adult system and report the recidivism rates after we follow them both in the juvenile and adult systems. The Department reports the following ***nine recidivism measures*** in three categories.

A. Juvenile Justice Recidivism

1. **Re-referral** refers to **any subsequent contact** that a juvenile has with DJJ intake staff, because of a new referral or alleged charge. Therefore, by definition, a re-referred juvenile has had at least two contacts with DJJ.
2. **Re-adjudication** refers to any juvenile, who is re-referred, has a judiciary hearing and is **adjudicated delinquent**.
3. **Re-commitment** refers to any juvenile who is re-referred, re-adjudicated, and **again committed** to the Department's custody for residential placement.

B. Criminal Justice Recidivism

1. **Arrest** refers to any individual, who **after contact** with the juvenile justice system re-offends and enters the adult criminal justice system.

2. **Conviction** refers to any individual, who is arrested, has a criminal hearing in the adult system, and is **convicted** or found guilty.
3. **Incarceration** refers to any individual who is arrested, convicted, and **incarcerated** in the adult prison system.

C. Juvenile and/or Criminal Justice Recidivism¹

1. **Re-referral/arrest** refers to any subsequent contact a youth has either in the juvenile or adult system.
2. **Re-adjudication/conviction** refers to any youth who has a judiciary hearing and is adjudicated delinquent or is arrested and has a criminal hearing in the adult system and is convicted or found guilty.
3. **Re-commitment/incarceration** refers to any juvenile who is again committed to the Department's custody for placement or is arrested, convicted, and incarcerated in the adult system.

STUDY POPULATION

The population for this study includes youths released from the following programs in fiscal year 1997: (1) The five Youth Centers, (2) Hickey Enhanced, (3) Hickey Impact, (4) Thomas J. O'Farrell Youth Center, (5) Victor Cullen Academy, (6) Cheltenham Young Women's Facility, (7) Good Shepherd Center, and (8) Group Homes (excluding therapeutic group homes). The Department's trend data shows that youths released from these major facilities account for the majority (62%) of the residential releases. Most of the youths served by these programs are the most serious and chronic juvenile offenders. The trend data also shows that the Department of Juvenile Justice receives about 43% repeat offenders each year at intake, whose cases involve intervention by the Department.

OBJECTIVES

This study shows prior referrals and offenses, the types of juveniles who become adult criminals, and the kind of offenses recidivists are most likely to commit. These identifications can serve as a guide to policy makers who determine the most appropriate way to serve Maryland's troubled youth.

The specific objectives of this study are:

¹ In this category, the Department of Juvenile Justice counts recidivists only once, even if a youth has offended in both systems.

1. Identify re-referral/arrest, re-adjudication/conviction, and re-commitment/incarceration recidivism rates for youths released from the selected facilities during the fiscal year 1997 at one, two, and three years after release.
2. Identify the various types of youths who are more likely or less likely to return to the system. The variables selected for these purposes are:
 - a. serious violent offenders versus nonviolent offenders;
 - b. felony versus non-felony offenders;
 - c. three or more prior referrals versus two or fewer prior referrals;
 - d. two or more prior placements versus one or no prior placements; and
 - e. length of commitment.
3. Compare and contrast, whenever possible, various patterns of recidivism among youths released from the selected programs.
4. Determine the most efficient and cost-effective programs.

DATA SOURCES

Information from two different databases (juvenile and adult) was compiled for this report. Data gathering involved the following procedures:

First, a list of youths released from the major residential programs was obtained using the Department's Information System for Youth Services (ISYS).

Second, a master tape containing gender, race, date of birth, complaint date, admission date, release date, referrals, adjudications, offense history and placement history was created for the selected releases. ISYS contains a complaint date field to indicate the date on which the case is received. Re-referral cases were identified if the same youth enters the juvenile justice system on a different charge after release from the commitment program. Court findings were used to track down the re-adjudicated cases. Admission dates to the residential facilities were used to calculate the recommitted admissions.

Third, arrest and disposition information were gathered from the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) for selected juveniles released in fiscal year 1997. Use of CJIS data allows juvenile recidivists and non-recidivists to be tracked for entry into the adult criminal justice system.

Last, from the master tape, sub-programs were created to analyze data on youths released from each facility. Each sub-program data set was compiled in such a way to help split the follow-up time into one, two, and three years after release.

STUDY RESULTS

The Department released 1,735 youths from the eight programs selected for this study.

This number represents about 62% of the youths (2,782) released from juvenile justice residential facilities that year. However, it should be noted that of the 40,713 youths received by intake staff in fiscal year 1997, this number of youths (1,735) represent only 4% of that total. The

reason is, the majority (57%) of youths entering the juvenile justice system are one-time only offenders, who do not require residential care.

The population characteristics and recidivism rates for the 1,735 youths released in fiscal year 1997 are as follows:

Population Characteristics

- The youths averaged 17 years at the time of release; 13.1 years of age at the time of their first referral to the Department of Juvenile Justice, and they had an average of 7.5 referrals when placed in one of the programs under study.
- The average number of felony and misdemeanor referrals were 3.1 and 4.4. The average number of violent referrals was 0.3.
- Almost 94% of the youths had at least one prior delinquency adjudication and the average age at the time of adjudication was 14.6.
- About 98% had been detained prior to their placement and the average age at the time of first detention was 15.0.
- About 67% had at least one prior residential placement and the average age at the time of first placement was 15.5.
- Approximately 65% had been placed on probation at least once and the average age at the time of first complaint which led to probation was 14.6.
- About 67% of the youths were African-American; 29% were Caucasian; 3% were Hispanic; and 2% were Asian, Native-American or biracial.
- The 1,735 youths' most serious adjudicated offenses were felonious assault and robbery with a deadly weapon (37%), narcotics felony (22%), auto theft (12%), serious property felony (8%) and violent person-to-person offenses (7%).

Table 1
The Most Serious Adjudicated Offense of 1,735 Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997

Offense Type	Number of Youths	% of Youths
Violent Person-to-Person Felony	124	7%
Felonious Assault & Robbery with a Deadly Weapon	633	37%
Narcotics Felony (Distribution)	386	22%
Auto Theft	212	12%
Serious Property Felony	133	8%
Other Felony Offense ²	14	1%
Handgun Violation	7	0.4%
Type I Misdemeanor ³	203	12%
Narcotics Misdemeanor (Possession)	11	1%
Type II Misdemeanor ⁴	12	1%

Recidivism Rates

The 1,735 Youths are tracked in both the juvenile and criminal justice systems for two full years from the date of each youth's fiscal year 1997 release. Although only a few percentage of youths recidivate during the third year, the third year follow-up is not a full year for all youths,

² Examples of other felony offenses are counterfeiting, shoplifting, and larceny.

³ Examples of Type I Misdemeanor offenses are driving while intoxicated, receiving stolen property, malicious destruction of property, gambling and probation violations.

⁴ Examples of Type II Misdemeanor offenses are disorderly conduct, in-school pager possession, graffiti, and fireworks violations.

and ranged from 28 to 36 months. Given below are the recidivism rates within three years after release and for one, two and three years after release.

Juvenile Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 1,735 youths released in FY 1997, 50% or 866 youths were re-referred to the Department; 24% (421) were re-adjudicated delinquent; and 17% (291) were re-committed to the Department's custody.
- About 43% (746 youths) were re-referred during the first year after release, 6% (107 youths) were re-referred during the second year after release, and only about 1% (13 youths) were re-referred during the third year after release.

Criminal Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 1,735 youths released in FY 1997, 53% (913) were referred to the criminal justice system at least once; 44% (765) were convicted of a criminal offense; and 30% (519) were incarcerated.
- About 26% (457) were referred to the criminal justice system within the first year after release, 18% (307) were referred during the second year after release, and 9% (149) were referred during the third year after release.
- Approximately 51% of the youths with criminal justice referrals had also been re-referred to the juvenile justice system at least once.

Juvenile and Criminal Justice Recidivism Combined

- Of the total 1,735 youths, 76% (1,315) have had subsequent contact with either the juvenile justice system, the criminal justice system, or both.
- About 47% (808) have been either re-adjudicated delinquent, convicted as adults, or both.
- About 32% (563) have been either re-committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice, incarcerated as adults, or both.
- About 59% (1,024) were referred to either the juvenile justice system or the criminal justice system within one year after release, 13% (228) during the second year after release, and 4% (63) during the third year after release.
- Of the 1,735 youths, 24% (420) have not reappeared in either Maryland's juvenile or criminal justice systems within three years after release.

Using the nine recidivism measures, the following Table 2 shows the subsequent juvenile or criminal involvement of 1,735 youths during the three-year period. For example, in Table 2 under the re-referred row, the numbers 746, 853 and 866 represent the number of

youths who were re-referred to DJJ intake within one, two, and three years after release.

If a youth is referred to DJJ intake more than once, this youth is counted only once. However, each youth's multiple charges and their dispositions are analyzed and the most serious disposition is reported. The majority of youths (746 or 43%) were re-referred to the juvenile justice system within the first year after release and a total of 853 youths were re-referred (746 in the first year and 107 in the second year) within two years after release. Similarly, within three years after release, a total of 866 (746+107+13) youths were re-referred to DJJ intake. Totals for other rows, such as re-adjudication, re-commitment, criminal referral, conviction, incarceration, juvenile and criminal justice referral, adjudication/conviction and commitment/incarceration are presented in the same manner, by adding the number of recidivists within one, two, and three years after release.

Table 2
Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 Within One, Two, and Three Years After Release

Recidivism Measures	1 Year After Release	2 Years After Release	3 Years After Release
Re-referral - Juvenile	746 (43%)	853 (49%)	866 (50%)
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	323 (19%)	405 (23%)	421 (24%)
Re-commitment - Juvenile	220 (13%)	285 (16%)	291 (17%)
Criminal Referral	457 (26%)	764 (44%)	913 (53%)
Criminal Conviction	386 (22%)	670 (39%)	765 (44%)
Criminal Incarceration	262 (15%)	460 (27%)	519 (30%)
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	1024 (59%)	1252 (72%)	1315 (76%)
Re-adjudication/Conviction	567 (33%)	758 (44%)	808 (47%)
Re-commitment/Incarceration	390 (22%)	536 (31%)	563 (32%)

Note: All percentages for Table 2 are calculated based on the total n = 1,735

The 746 re-referred recidivists within one year after release were not adjudicated or

committed for their first charges in the same year after release. Some were either adjudicated and/or committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice for their subsequent and most serious charges during the second or third year after their release. To account for this deepest

penetration in the system, it was necessary to track the most serious disposition of re-referred recidivists by considering all their charges that came to the juvenile or criminal justice systems within one year after release.

The following Table 3 compares the characteristics of juvenile offenders, who returned to the Department to those who did not return. Focusing on the differences between recidivists and non-recidivists, these data indicate:

- Males, African-Americans, and Baltimore City youths are more likely than others to re-offend, as are those who enter the juvenile justice system at younger ages.
- The recidivists on an average enter the system as early as 12.6 years and are a year younger than the non-recidivists.
- The average age of recidivists at the time of their fiscal year 1997 admission was 15.6, while the average age of non-recidivists was 16.9.
- The average age at the time of release was 16.4 for the recidivists and 17.6 for the non-recidivists.
- The non-recidivists were already nearing their upper juvenile age limit 18, at the time of their fiscal year 1997 release and were there for less likely to return to the juvenile justice system.

Table 3
Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System
Youths Released from the Selected Eight Programs in FY 1997

Population Characteristics	Recidivists	Non-recidivists	Total
Race			
African-American	72%	62%	67%
Caucasian	24%	33%	29%
Hispanic	3%	2%	3%
Other Race Groups	1%	3%	2%
Gender			
Males	95%	91%	93%
Females	5%	9%	7%
County of Residence			
Allegany	0.6%	1.1%	0.8%
Anne Arundel	6.3%	8.0%	7.1%
Baltimore County	11.2%	10.5%	10.9%
Calvert	0.6%	1.3%	0.9%
Caroline	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%
Carroll	1.3%	0.7%	1.0%
Cecil	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Charles	2.2%	3.6%	2.9%
Dorchester	0.5%	0.2%	0.4%
Frederick	3.0%	2.3%	2.6%
Garrett	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%
Harford	2.6%	2.3%	2.4%
Howard	1.7%	1.0%	1.3%
Kent	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
Montgomery	8.6%	12.8%	10.7%
Prince George's	10.8%	16.3%	13.6%
Queen Anne's	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
St. Mary's	0.7%	1.2%	0.9%
Somerset	0.8%	0.1%	0.5%
Talbot	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Washington	2.0%	3.9%	3.0%
Wicomico	2.0%	0.6%	1.3%
Worcester	0.1%	0.5%	0.3%
Baltimore City	39.2%	25.7%	32.5%
Out of State	1.4%	4.0%	2.7%
Average age at first complaint	12.6	13.6	13.1
Average age at FY 97 admission	15.6	16.9	16.3
Average age at FY 97 release	16.4	17.6	17.0
Average # felony referrals	3.3	2.9	3.1
Average # misdemeanor referrals	4.7	4.1	4.4

IMPLICATIONS

- Because most of the programs studied were serving serious, chronic and violent offenders, 2 out of 3 youths studied were already recidivists at the time of their release in fiscal year 1997. About 94% had at least one prior delinquency adjudication, and 98% had been detained at least once prior to their residential placement.
- A review of this population's racial dynamics reflects the Department's ongoing concerns about the disproportionate representation of African-American males in the juvenile justice system.
- While the majority of these serious juvenile offenders (76%) have had subsequent contact with either juvenile or criminal justice systems, only 32% required subsequent residential placements in either system. Thus, the majority of recidivist youths seem to have returned for less serious charge, signifying the juvenile justice system's public safety and fiscal benefits.

Subsequent sections will analyze each program's services, population characteristics, and recidivism rates comparing the recidivists with non-recidivists. Each program serves relatively different types of juvenile offenders and provides significantly different types of services; thus, cross-program comparative recidivism analyses have only limited applications for program evaluation.

Despite each program's unique qualities all the studied facilities handle the Department's most difficult juvenile offenders. Many of these youths have a history of substance abuse, academic failure, and emotional problems. As previously noted, the majority of youths were repeat offenders at the time of their placement, with an average of 7.5 prior referrals to the Department of Juvenile Justice. These youths, on average were only 13.1 years old at the time of their first referral to the department of Juvenile Justice, having not been receptive to school-based intervention, prevention programs, or other community-based youth diversion activities. Although only a small fraction of the fiscal year 1997 juvenile justice population, these 1,735 youths were the Department's most difficult and most costly population.

Additionally, with such a large portion of the Department's prior year budgets allocated to residential programming, community-based programming such as aftercare and other recidivism prevention services have been significantly limited in recent years. The Department has begun rebuilding such programs to help ease youths' transition back to their communities, while trying to protect public safety and prevent recidivism. The recidivism rates in this report amply illustrate the importance of creating more intensive aftercare programs and increasing investments in community-based programs.

Ultimately, what all the programs in this study have in common is that they handle the Department's most difficult offenders. The following table summarizes each program's recidivism measures.

Table 4
RECIDIVISM DATA - SUMMARY TABLE
Recidivism rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 by Program

Recidivism Measures	Youth Centers N = 501	Hickey Enhanced N= 149	Hickey Impact N =445	Victor Cullen N=353	O'Farrell Center N=49	Young Women N = 39	Good Shep- herd N=50	Group Homes N=149	Total N= 1735
<u>Juvenile</u>									
Re-referral--juvenile	51%	25%	60%	52%	59%	33%	36%	40%	50%
Re-adjudication Delinquent	27%	6%	33%	21%	18%	5%	12%	23%	22%
Re-commitment	18%	3%	24%	16%	12%	3%	8%	15%	13%
<u>Criminal</u>									
Referral	59%	64%	47%	60%	49%	33%	14%	39%	59%
Conviction	51%	58%	38%	52%	37%	23%	8%	27%	54%
Incarceration	53%	45%	25%	37%	24%	13%	8%	18%	41%
<u>Juvenile/Criminal</u>									
Referral	80%	71%	78%	81%	80%	49%	44%	65%	78%
Re-adjudication/Conviction	52%	47%	49%	47%	35%	18%	14%	40%	48%
Re-commitment/Incarceration	35%	38%	34%	35%	22%	8%	10%	26%	33%

These findings indicate that it is rare for any programs to entirely eliminate a youth's future contact with the juvenile or adult criminal justice systems. Despite this unfortunate reality, 67% of the total 1,735 youths released from the selected eight programs were not again placed in either a juvenile or correctional facility. This is especially significant given that these youths had an average of 7.5 juvenile justice referrals when placed in the Department's custody. Given this difficult, multi-offending population, the relatively low numbers of youths subsequently committed to juvenile or criminal justice facilities indicate that residential juvenile justice programs generally release less risky offenders than they accept.

Additionally, these findings reveal significant recidivism rate reductions since fiscal year 1994. All of the six programs studied in the Department's January 1997 report now show reduced rates for most, if not all measures for youths released in fiscal year 1995 and 1997. For example, the last three columns of the following table show that the Department's re-referral rate declined from 55% in fiscal year 1994 to 50% in 1995 and 51% in 1997. The combined juvenile/criminal referral rate was reduced from 82% in fiscal year 1994 to 79% in 1995 and 78%

in 1997. The combined re-commitment/incarceration rate declined from 46% in fiscal year 1994

to 34% in 1995 and 1997. Recidivism rates for specific programs also declined from fiscal year 1994 to 1995 and 1997 for most of the programs. This is evident by comparing the following table with the one above.

Table 5
RECIDIVISM DATA - SUMMARY TABLE
Recidivism rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1994 by Program &
Comparison of FY 1994 Rates with FY 1995 and FY 1997 Rates

Recidivism Measures	Youth Centers n =359	Hickey Enhanced n = 94	Hickey Impact n=270	Victor Cullen n=139	O'Farrell Center n = 42	Young Women n =43	Totals FY 94 n = 947	Totals FY 95 n=1202	Totals FY 97 n=1536
<u>Juvenile</u>									
Re-referral--juvenile	58%	43%	57%	58%	55%	28%	55%	50%	51%
Re-adjudication Delinquent	24%	14%	26%	21%	24%	9%	22%	23%	25%
Re-commitment	18%	7%	19%	11%	10%	5%	15%	13%	17%
<u>Criminal</u>									
Referral	67%	78%	46%	70%	57%	40%	61%	61%	55%
Conviction	44%	53%	34%	53%	43%	30%	43%	55%	47%
Incarceration	39%	51%	23%	44%	33%	16%	35%	43%	32%
<u>Juvenile/Criminal</u>									
Referral	84%	93%	78%	88%	81%	53%	82%	79%	78%
Re-adjudication/Conviction	58%	65%	55%	68%	60%	37%	58%	49%	48%
Re-commitment/Incarceration	51%	59%	37%	52%	38%	21%	46%	34%	34%

COMPARISON OF MARYLAND'S RECIDIVISM RATES WITH OTHER STATES

There are no national juvenile justice recidivism standards, nor have there been any reported estimates of nationwide juvenile justice facility recidivism rates. This absence of national data reflects the extent to which juvenile recidivism research methods and definitions vary within both the academic and governmental juvenile justice communities. As a result, researchers typically refer to very limited state and local juvenile justice research efforts to present a range of possible recidivism estimates. For example, the following studies are used as examples of the recidivism measures explained above.

- (1) Florida state's recidivism report shows about 53% subsequent DJJ referrals, 23%

subsequent adult arrests and 64% subsequent referrals or arrests within one year after fiscal year 1995 releases. The recidivism rates for high-risk residential commitment programs were: 48% subsequent DJJ referrals, 42% subsequent adult arrests and 68% subsequent referrals or arrests. Thus, the overall subsequent referral/arrest rate varied from a high of 68% for youth released from high-residential programs to a low of 55% for youth released from Level 2 programs. Maryland's recidivism rates on high-risk residential commitment programs were 11% lower than Florida's rates with one year follow-up of fiscal year 1995 releases. They were: 39% for subsequent DJJ referrals, 28% for subsequent adult arrests and 57% subsequent referrals or adults.

- (2) California, Ohio, Michigan, Oregon, Texas, Florida, Maryland, and New York report re-referral and arrest rates for youths released from juvenile justice programs. However, the follow-up time varies and recidivism rates range from 45% to 77%. Maryland ranks in the middle with 59% re-referred or arrested within one year or 12 months after release.
- (3) As an example of system-wide Re-referral recidivism analysis, a 1988 study found that 40% of total youths referred as first offenders to the Arizona and Utah juvenile court systems returned with at least one subsequent offense. This re-referral recidivism rate increased to 59% for second offenders.
- (4) A 1996 report on Delaware's only state-operated residential program for committed juvenile offenders, showed a 50% re-referral recidivism rate within one year after release from the facility. The study also reported somewhat lower re-referral recidivism rates for Delaware's less costly day programming centers. This study supported Delaware's decision to create comprehensive daytime programs as alternatives to residential care.
- (5) In South Carolina, a 1995 criminal justice recidivism study of juvenile justice youths born in 1967 revealed that only 40% of the total youths went on to become adult offenders by age 27. However, of the total 1967 birth-year cohort, those who had been committed to a residential juvenile facility reappeared in the criminal justice system at a rate of 66% by age 27. This study documents the extent to which juvenile justice system penetration predicts potential adult criminality and long-term cost implications.
- (6) In January and February of 1999, the Bureau of Data and Research of the Florida Department of Juvenile Justice conducted two surveys to find out the measurement of juvenile recidivism throughout the United States⁵. According to this survey findings:
 - a. the length of the follow-up period and the juvenile justice system varied in each state;
 - b. Twenty-six states report some method of measuring juvenile recidivism and 20 have studied a cohort of juvenile offenders to measure subsequent criminal behavior;
 - c. Alaska, Florida, Maryland and Virginia have conducted follow-up studies of first-

⁵ National Comparisons from State Recidivism Studies: Prepared by the Bureau of Data and Research, Florida Department of Juvenile Justice, Management Report Number 99-13, October 1999.

time offenders; and

- d. Maryland and Florida are the only two states to study nine different measures of recidivism, i.e., juvenile re-referral or adult arrest, juvenile adjudication or adult conviction, and juvenile commitment or adult sentence.

DISCUSSION ON COST-EFFECTIVENESS

Consistent with previous reports, the Department believes that the most appropriate measure for estimating a program's cost-effectiveness is the combined juvenile commitment and adult criminal incarceration recidivism rate. However, comparative cost effectiveness indicators are presented in this report with **caution** since each residential program provides a unique set of services and treats varying types of offenders.

The Department's average cost per youth in each program has been calculated using each program's fiscal year 1997 daily costs and the average length of stay observed for each program.

Table 6
AVERAGE COST PER YOUTH RELEASED BY PROGRAM
Based on Fiscal Year 1997 Expenditures and Observed Average Length of Stay

Program	Average Cost per Youth	Average Length of Stay in Days
Youth Centers	\$21,348	201
Hickey Enhanced	\$53,487	394
Hickey Impact	\$12,218	90
Victor Cullen	\$32,465	255
O' Farrell Center	\$50,937	313
Young Women	\$43,969	258

Good Shepherd and group homes were not included in the fiscal year 1994 releases study. These are per-diem contract programs.

These costs closely reflect those observed in the Department's January 1998 report on fiscal year 1995 releases. The one exception, however, is the Hickey Enhanced Program, where the average length of stay has been increased to over a full year in recent years.

Since the combined juvenile re-commitment and criminal incarceration recidivism measure has the most significant fiscal implications, this measure is most appropriate from a cost-effectiveness standpoint. Thus, this report's cost-effectiveness indicators are based on the number of youths served who are not subsequently re-committed to the Department or

incarcerated in the criminal justice system. Using this recidivism measure, the cost effectiveness indicators are calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Cost per non-recidivist youth} = \frac{\text{cost per youth} * \text{total youths released}}{\text{number of non-recidivists}}$$

Using the above formula, i.e., the average cost per youth served in each program and each program's re-commitment/incarceration recidivism rate, each program's cost effectiveness indicators for fiscal years 1994, 1995 and 1997 are:

Table 7
PROGRAM COSTS PER YOUTH NOT RE-COMMITTED OR INCARCERATED
Cost per Non-Recidivist Youth

Program	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1997
Youth Centers	\$38,409	\$28,675	\$32,707
Hickey Enhanced	\$83,749	\$66,236	\$86,626
Hickey Impact	\$17,961	\$16,144	\$18,431
O'Farrell Center	\$70,072	\$77,319	\$65,682
Victor Cullen	\$69,120	\$59,184	\$50,044
Cheltenham Young Women	\$39,345	\$34,659	\$47,633

As previously mentioned, this report generally reveals lower recidivism rates than those documented in the Department's January 1997 study based on FY 1994 releases. The table above indicates how these reduced recidivism rates also served to lower the program's cost per non recidivist youth. The Hickey Enhanced, and Cheltenham Young Women's programs are the exceptions. The costs per non recidivist program increased in both these programs from FY 1994, because their average length of stay also increased. Hickey Enhanced youths stay longer than other youths and young women have special Gynecological needs and the treatment of it is expensive. The length of stay in Hickey Enhanced program increased from 330 days in FY 1995 to 394 and in Cheltenham Young Women's program from 222 to 258. This along with the treatment necessary treatment factors could have increased the cost per bed.

Consistent with the Department's January 1997 report, this table indicates that the Hickey Impact program has been the most cost-effective in serving its population. The program's favorable cost-effectiveness indicator reflects the very low costs per youth associated with such a short-term program. This finding supports recent Departmental decisions to create similar Department operated, high-intensity, short-term residential programs for juvenile offenders. Specifically in fiscal year 1997, the Department opened a new "Impact Plus" program at the Cheltenham Youth Facility, a new "Impact Plus One" program at the Waxter Children's Center, and in FY 1998, an intermediate program at Hickey. All these short-term residential programs were developed in response to rapidly growing demands to treat less difficult youths.

Longer term programs serve considerably more difficult youths than do these short-term programs. Among longer-term programs, the Department-operated Youth Centers and Cheltenham Young Women's program appear to be most-cost effective.

The Department of Fiscal Services reported that the cost per inmate in adult correctional programs in FY 1998 was \$20,800 annually. Given the observed 34% re-commitment/incarceration recidivism rate for youths released in fiscal year 1997 from the major six programs mentioned in this section, these programs helped keep 1,017 youths from subsequently entering juvenile or adult facilities. Using the Fiscal Services' \$20,800 figure, these 1997 juvenile justice programs may have reduced today's prison costs by as much as \$21.1 million annually.

SPECIFIC PROGRAM REVIEW

1. Youth Centers

In 1997, the Department operated five Youth Center facilities in Western Maryland. Then evaluated as a single program, the Department's Youth Centers provide delinquent males with comprehensive residential programming, substance abuse treatment, and skills development. In their wilderness setting, the Youth Centers also emphasize community service, self-sufficiency and character development. The Youth Centers of 1997 handled primarily serious property and narcotics offenders, although some violent offenders were also served at these staff-secure facilities. The Youth Centers released 501 youths in fiscal year 1997, with an average length of stay of 6.6 months.

Population Characteristics

- The youths averaged 17 years at the time of release; 13.3 years of age at the time of their first referral to the Department of Juvenile Justice; and they had an average of 7.5 referrals prior to their fiscal year 1997 release.
- The average number of felony and misdemeanor referrals were 3.0 and 4.5. The average number of violent referrals was 0.2.
- About 95% of the youths had at least one prior delinquency adjudication and the average age at the time of first adjudication was 14.9.
- 99% had been detained prior to their placement and the average age at the time of first detention was 15.2.
- 67% had at least one prior residential placement and the average age at the time of first admission was 15.7.
- 68% had been placed on probation at least once and the average age at the time of first complaint which led to probation was 14.8.
- About 62% of the youths were African-American; 34% were Caucasian; 2 % were Hispanic; and 2% were Asian, Native-American or biracial.
- The 501 youths' most serious adjudicated offenses were felonious assault and robbery with a deadly weapon (35%), narcotics felony (27%), auto theft (13%),

and serious property felony (9%).

Table 8
The Most serious Adjudicated Offenses of Youths Released from
Youth Centers in FY 1997

Offense Type	Number of Youths	% of Youths
Violent Person-to-Person Felony	17	3%
Felonious Assault & Robbery with a Deadly Weapon	177	35%
Narcotics Felony (Distribution)	136	27%
Auto Theft	67	13%
Serious Property Felony	47	9%
Other Felony Offense ⁶	3	1%
Handgun Violation	1	0.2%
Type I Misdemeanor ⁷	45	9%
Narcotics Misdemeanor (Possession)	5	1%
Type II Misdemeanor ⁸	3	1%

Juvenile Justice Recidivism

⁶ Examples of other felony offenses are counterfeiting, shoplifting, and larceny.

⁷ Examples of Type I Misdemeanor offenses are driving while intoxicated, receiving stolen property, malicious destruction of property, gambling and probation violations

⁸ Examples of Type II Misdemeanor offenses are disorderly conduct, in-school pager possession, graffiti and fireworks violations.

- Of the total 501 youths released in FY 1997, 51% or 258 youths were re-referred to the Department; 27% (137) were re-adjudicated delinquent; and 18% (90) were re-committed to the Department's custody.
- About 46% (230 youths) were re-referred during the first year after release, 5% (25 youths) were re-referred during the second year after release, and only 0.6% (3 youths) were re-referred during the third year after release.

Criminal Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 501 youths released in FY 1997, 59% (295) were referred to the criminal justice system at least once; 51% (254) were convicted of a criminal offense; and 33% (164) were incarcerated.
- About 27% (137) were referred to the criminal justice system within the first year after release, 23% (115) were referred during the second year after release, and 9% (43) were referred during the third year after release.
- Approximately 52% of the youths with criminal justice referrals had also been re-referred to the juvenile justice system at least once.

Juvenile and Criminal Justice Recidivism Combined

- Of the total 501 youths, 80% (401) have had subsequent contact with either the juvenile justice system, the criminal justice system or both.
- About 52% (263) have been either re-adjudicated delinquent, convicted as adults, or both.
- About 35% (174) have been either re-committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice, incarcerated as adults, or both.
- About 63% (314) were referred to either the juvenile justice system or the criminal justice system within one year after release, 14% (72) during the second year after release, and 3% (15) during the third year after release.
- Approximately 20% (100) have not reappeared in either Maryland's juvenile or criminal justice systems within three years after release.

Using the nine recidivism measures, the following Table 9 shows the subsequent juvenile or criminal involvement of 501 youths during the three-year period. For example, in Table 9 under the re-referred row, the numbers 230, 255 and 258 represent the number of youths who were re-referred to DJJ intake within one, two, and three years after release. Totals for other rows, such as re-adjudication, re-commitment, criminal referral, conviction, incarceration, juvenile and criminal justice referral, adjudication/conviction and commitment/incarceration are presented in the same manner, by adding the number of recidivists within one, two, and three years after release.

Table 9 also shows that the majority of youths (46%) returned to the juvenile justice system within the first year after release, about 5% in the second year and 0.6% or three youths returned in the third year. However in the criminal justice system, although the majority was referred within the first year (27%) after release from the juvenile justice system, an additional 23% and 9% of the total 501 youths were referred during the second and third years, respectively.

Table 9
Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 Within One, Two, and Three Years After Release: Youth Centers

Recidivism Measures	1 Year After Release	2 Years After Release	3 Years After Release
Re-referral - Juvenile	230 (46%)	255 (51%)	258 (51%)
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	112 (22%)	135 (27%)	137 (27%)
Re-commitment - Juvenile	72 (14%)	90 (18%)	90 (18%)
Criminal Referral	137 (27%)	252 (50%)	295 (59%)
Criminal Conviction	118 (24%)	226 (45%)	254 (51%)
Criminal Incarceration	76 (15%)	149 (30%)	164 (33%)
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	314 (63%)	386 (77%)	401 (80%)
Re-adjudication/Conviction	185 (37%)	254 (51%)	263 (52%)
Re-commitment/Incarceration	119 (24%)	170 (34%)	174 (35%)

Note: All percentages for Table 9 are calculated based on the total n = 501

The following Table 10 data indicate that between fiscal year 1994 and 1997 releases, Youth Centers' recidivism rates have been reduced according to all measures. Ongoing efforts to expand aftercare and improve programming services should further reduce the Youth Centers' recidivism rates.

The average cost per youth released from the Youth Centers in 1997 was \$21,348. Given a 35% re-commitment/incarceration recidivism rate, the cost per non-recidivist youth was \$32,707.

Table 10
Comparison of Recidivism Rates between Fiscal Years 1994, 1995 & 1997
Youth Centers

Recidivism Measures	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1997
Re-referral - Juvenile	58%	53%	51%
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	24%	23%	27%
Re-commitment - Juvenile	18%	14%	18%
Criminal Referral	67%	66%	59%
Criminal Conviction	44%	62%	51%
Criminal Incarceration	39%	48%	33%
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	84%	83%	80%
Re-adjudication/Conviction	58%	52%	52%
Re-commitment/Incarceration	51%	37%	35%

Table 11 compares the characteristics of juvenile offenders, who returned to the Department to those who did not return. Focusing on the differences between recidivists and non-recidivists, these data indicate that African-Americans, and Baltimore City (33%), Prince George's (13%) and Baltimore County youths (12%) are more likely than others to re-offend, and the recidivists enter the juvenile justice system at younger ages. The data also indicate that the recidivists on an average enter the system as early as 13.0 years and are 1.1 years younger than the non-recidivists at the time of their fiscal 1997 admission to Youth Centers. The average age of recidivists at the time of their fiscal year 1997 admission to Youth Centers was 15.8, while the average age of non-recidivists was 16.9. The average age at the time of release was 16.6 for the recidivists and 17.5 for the non-recidivists. This shows that the non-recidivists were already nearing their upper juvenile age limit 18, at the time of their fiscal year 1997 release and were less likely to return to the juvenile justice system.

Table 11
Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System
Youths Released from Youth Center Programs in FY 1997

Population Characteristics	Recidivists	Non-recidivists	Total
Race			
African-American	68%	55%	62%
Caucasian	27%	42%	34%
Hispanic	3%	2%	2%
Other Race Groups	2%	2%	2%
County of Residence			
Allegany	0.8%	1.2%	1.0%
Anne Arundel	8.9%	11.2%	10.0%
Baltimore County	11.6%	13.2%	12.4%
Calvert	0.4%	1.7%	1.0%
Caroline	0.8%	0.0%	0.4%
Carroll	3.1%	2.1%	2.6%
Cecil	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%
Charles	2.3%	3.3%	2.8%
Frederick	3.1%	2.5%	2.8%
Garrett	1.6%	2.1%	1.8%
Harford	3.5%	2.5%	3.0%
Howard	0.4%	1.7%	1.0%
Kent	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%
Montgomery	7.0%	6.2%	6.6%
Prince George's	12.8%	14.9%	14.0%
Queen Anne's	2.3%	0.8%	1.6%
St. Mary's	0.0%	1.2%	0.6%
Somerset	0.8%	0.4%	0.6%
Talbot	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
Washington	2.3%	5.0%	3.6%
Wicomico	3.5%	0.8%	2.2%
Worcester	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%
Baltimore City	32.6%	25.6%	29.1%
Out of State	0.8%	2.9%	1.8%
Average age at first complaint	13.0	13.6	13.3
Average age at admission	15.8	16.9	16.4
Average age at release	16.6	17.5	17.0
Average # felony referrals	3.0	2.9	3.0
Average # misdemeanor referrals	4.7	4.3	4.5

2. Charles H. Hickey Jr. Enhanced Security Program

The Department owns the Charles H. Hickey Jr. School, a large juvenile justice complex in Baltimore County. This privatized facility has been operated by Youth Services International, a private, for-profit, youth services corporation, since May 1993. The campus houses three distinct residential programs for youths in the Department's custody: Enhanced Security, Impact and TAMAR (sex offenders). The Enhanced and Impact programs were selected for this review. The TAMAR program was not included because it is a very long-term program that released only 8 youths in fiscal year 1997.

As the Department's most secure committed program, Hickey Enhanced provides intensive, long-term programming, rigorous physical and mental challenges, advanced vocational training, and special education services. This program also accepts larger, older and more threatening juvenile offenders than most other available programs, as well as youths who fail to complete other programs or who re-offend after previous multiple residential placements.

Because the Enhanced Program handles some of the Department's most difficult youths, many youths who re-offend after completing the Enhanced program are found not amenable to treatment in the juvenile justice system and are waived into the criminal justice system. Thus, this program's juvenile re-referral rate is significantly higher than its juvenile re-adjudication rate. This finding indicates that Hickey Enhanced program may be a type of "last chance" program for repeat-juvenile offenders.

In fiscal year 1997, 149 youths were released from the Enhanced program, with an average length of stay of 13 months.

Population Characteristics

- The youths averaged 17.9 years of age at the time of their release; 12.8 years of age at the time of their first referral to the Department; and they had an average of 8.9 referrals prior to their fiscal year 1997 release.
- The average number of felony and misdemeanor referrals were 4.0 and 4.9. The average number of violent referrals was 0.7.
- Almost 100% of the youths had at least one prior delinquency adjudication and the average age at the time of first adjudication was 14.4.
- 99% had been detained prior to their placement and the average age at the time of first detention was 14.8.
- 85% had at least one prior residential placement and the average age at the time of first admission was 15.4.
- 56% had been placed on probation at least once and the average age at the time of first complaint which led to probation was 14.0.

- About 75% of the youths were African-American; 22% were Caucasian; 3% were Hispanic; and 1% were Asian, Native-American or biracial.
- The 149 youths' most serious adjudicated offenses were felonious assault and robbery with a deadly weapon (38%), violent person-to-person offenses (23%), narcotics felony (12%), auto theft (9%), and serious property felony (9%).

Table 12
The Most Serious Adjudicated Offenses of Youths Released from
Hickey Enhanced Program in FY 1997

Offense Type	Number of Youths	% of Youths
Violent Person-to-Person Felony	34	23%
Felonious Assault & Robbery with a Deadly Weapon	56	38%
Narcotics Felony (Distribution)	18	12%
Auto Theft	14	9%
Serious Property Felony	13	9%
Other Felony Offense	0	0%
Handgun Violation	3	2%
Type I Misdemeanor	11	7%
Narcotics Misdemeanor (Possession)	0	0%
Type II Misdemeanor	0	0%

Juvenile Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 149 youths released in FY 1997, 25% or 37 youths were re-referred to the Department; 6% (9) were re-adjudicated delinquent; and 3% (5) were re-committed to the Department's custody.
- About 22% (33 youths) were re-referred during the first year after release, 3% (4 youths) were re-referred during the second year after release, and none was re-referred during the third year after release.

Criminal Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 149 youths released in FY 1997, 64% (95) were referred to the criminal justice system at least once; 58% (86) were convicted of a criminal offense; and 45% (67) were incarcerated within three years after release.
- About 42% (62) were referred to the criminal justice system within the first year after release, 17% (25) were referred during the second year after release, and 5% (8) were referred during the third year after release.
- Approximately 27% of the youths with criminal justice referrals had also been re-referred to the juvenile justice system at least once.

Juvenile and Criminal Justice Recidivism Combined

- Of the total 149 youths, 71% (106) have had subsequent contact with either the juvenile justice system, the criminal justice system or both.
- About 47% (70) have been either re-adjudicated delinquent, convicted as adults, or both.
- About 38% (57) have been either re-committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice, incarcerated as adults, or both.
- About 54% (81) were referred to either the juvenile justice system or the criminal justice system within one year after release, 13% (19) during the second year after release, and 4% (6) during the third year after release.
- Of the 149 youths, 29% (43) have not reappeared in either Maryland's juvenile or criminal justice systems within three years after release.

Using the nine recidivism measures, Table 13 shows the subsequent juvenile or criminal involvement of 149 youths during the three-year period. For example, in Table 13 under the re-referred row, the numbers 33, 37 and 37 represent the number of youths who were re-referred to DJJ intake within one, two, and three years after release. Totals for other rows, such as re-adjudication, re-commitment, criminal referral, conviction, incarceration, juvenile and criminal justice referral, adjudication/conviction and commitment/incarceration are presented in the same manner, by adding the number of recidivists within one, two, and three years after release.

The majority of youths (22%) returned to the juvenile justice system within the first year after release, about 3% in the second year, and none returned in the third year. However in the criminal justice system although the majority (42%) were referred within the first year after release from the juvenile justice system, 17% and 5% were referred during the second and third years, respectively.

Table 13
Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 Within One, Two and
Three Years After Release: Hickey Enhanced Program

Recidivism Measures	1 Year After Release	2 Years After Release	3 Years After Release
Re-referral - Juvenile	33 (22%)	37 (25%)	37 (25%)
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	8 (5%)	9 (6%)	9 (6%)
Re-commitment - Juvenile	4 (3%)	5 (3%)	5 (3%)
Criminal Referral	62 (42%)	87 (58%)	95 (64%)
Criminal Conviction	56 (38%)	78 (52%)	86 (58%)
Criminal Incarceration	43 (29%)	61 (41%)	67 (45%)
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	81 (54%)	100 (67%)	106 (71%)
Re-adjudication/Conviction	51 (34%)	65 (44%)	70 (47%)
Re-commitment/Incarceration	37 (25%)	51 (34%)	57 (38%)

Note: All percentages for Table 13 are calculated based on the total n = 149

The following Table 14 data indicate that Hickey enhanced Program's recidivism rates have been reduced according to all measures from FY 1994. Ongoing efforts to expand aftercare and improve programming services should further reduce the Hickey Enhanced Program's recidivism rates.

The average cost per youth released from the Hickey Enhanced program in 1997 was \$ 53,487. Given a 38% re-commitment/incarceration recidivism rate, the cost per non-recidivist youth was \$86,626.

Table 14
Comparison of Recidivism Rates Between Fiscal Years 1994, 1995 & 1997
Hickey Enhanced Program

Recidivism Measures	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1997
Re-referral - Juvenile	43%	35%	25%
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	14%	10%	6%
Re-commitment - Juvenile	7%	6%	3%
Criminal Referral	78%	60%	64%
Criminal Conviction	53%	56%	58%
Criminal Incarceration	51%	42%	45%
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	93%	72%	71%
Re-adjudication/Conviction	65%	44%	47%
Re-commitment/Incarceration	59%	29%	38%

Table 15 compares the characteristics of juvenile offenders, who returned to the Department to those who did not return. Focusing on the differences between recidivists and non-recidivists, these data indicate that African-Americans, and Baltimore City (41%), Baltimore (16%) and Montgomery County youths (11%) are more likely than others to re-offend, as are those who enter the juvenile justice system at younger ages. The data also indicate that the recidivists on an average entered the system as early as 11.6 years and were 1.6 years younger than the non-recidivists at the time of their FY 1997 admission to Hickey Enhanced Program. The average age of recidivists at the time of their fiscal year 1997 admission to the Hickey Enhanced Program was 15.6, while the average age of non-recidivists was 17.2. The average age at the time of release was 16.9 for the recidivists and 18.3 for the non-recidivists. This shows that the non-recidivists were already above the upper juvenile age limit 18, at the time of their fiscal year 1997 release and could not have returned to the juvenile justice system.

Table 15
Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System
Youths Released from Hickey Enhanced Program in FY 1997

Population Characteristics	Recidivists	Non-recidivists	Total
Race			
African-American	78%	73%	75%
Caucasian	19%	22%	22%
Hispanic	3%	3%	3%
Other Race Groups	0%	2%	1%
County of Residence			
Anne Arundel	8.1%	5.4%	6.0%
Baltimore County	16.2%	10.7%	12.1%
Calvert	2.7%	0.0%	0.7%
Carroll	2.7%	0.0%	0.7%
Charles	0.0%	7.1%	5.4%
Frederick	0.0%	0.9%	0.7%
Harford	0.0%	1.8%	1.3%
Howard	2.7%	0.9%	1.3%
Montgomery	10.8%	17.0%	15.4%
Prince George's	5.4%	21.4%	17.4%
Queen Anne's	0.0%	2.7%	2.0%
St. Mary's	0.0%	0.9%	0.7%
Somerset	2.7%	0.0%	0.7%
Washington	0.0%	1.8%	1.3%
Wicomico	5.4%	0.0%	1.3%
Baltimore City	40.5%	24.1%	28.2%
Out of State	2.7%	5.4%	4.7%
Average age at first complaint	11.6	13.2	12.8
Average age at admission	15.6	17.2	16.8
Average age at release	16.9	18.3	17.9
Average # felony referrals	5.3	3.6	4.0
Average # misdemeanor referrals	6.2	4.4	4.9

3. Charles H. Hickey Jr. Impact Program

The Charles H. Hickey Jr. School's Impact Program generally handles less serious male offenders than most other residential juvenile justice programs. This high-intensity, 60 to 90-day program is designed to break patterns of chronic delinquency before youths begin committing more serious and violent offenses. As a result, youths placed in the Impact program tend to be less threatening than youths in other, longer term, residential facilities. In fiscal year 1997, the Department created similar state-operated programs at the Cheltenham Youth Facility and at the Waxter Children's Center.

In fiscal year 1997, 445 youths were released from the Hickey Impact program with an average length of stay of 3 months.

Population Characteristics

- The youths averaged 16.7 years of age at the time of their release; 13.2 years of age at the time of their first referral to the Department; and they had an average of 6.6 referrals when placed in one of the programs under study.
- The average number of felony and misdemeanor referrals were 2.6 and 4.0. The average number of violent referrals was 0.2.
- About 88% of the youths had at least one prior delinquency adjudication and the average age at the time of first adjudication was 14.9.
- 98% had been detained prior to their placement and the average age at the time of first detention was 15.2.
- 52% had at least one prior residential placement and the average age at the time of first admission was 15.7.
- 63% had been placed on probation at least once and the average age at the time of this complaint was 15.0.
- About 66% of the youths were African-American; 27% were Caucasian; 4% were Hispanic; and 3% were Asian, Native-American or biracial.
- The 445 youths' most serious adjudicated offenses were felonious assault and robbery with a deadly weapon (35%), narcotics felony (24%), auto theft (14%), serious property felony (8%) and violent person-to-person felony (6%).

Table 16
The Most serious Adjudicated Offenses of Youths Released from
Hickey Impact Program in FY 1997

Offense Type	Number of Youths	% of Youths
Violent Person-to-Person Felony	25	6%
Felonious Assault & Robbery with a Deadly Weapon	156	35%
Narcotics Felony (Distribution)	105	24%
Auto Theft	62	14%
Serious Property Felony	34	8%
Other Felony Offense	6	1%
Handgun Violation	0	0%
Type I Misdemeanor	51	11%
Narcotics Misdemeanor (Possession)	4	1%
Type II Misdemeanor	2	0.4%

Juvenile Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 445 youths released in FY 1997, 60% or 266 youths were re-referred to the Department; 33% (149) were re-adjudicated delinquent; and 24% (105) were re-committed to the Department's custody.
- Of the total 445 youths released in FY 1997, 50% (222 youths) were re-referred during the first year after release, 8% (37 youths) were re-referred during the second year after release, and 2% (7 youths) were re-referred during the third year after release.

Criminal Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 445 youths released in FY 1997, 47% (209) were referred to the criminal justice system at least once; 38% (170) were convicted of a criminal offense; and 25% (110) were incarcerated within three years after release.
- Of the total 445 youths released in FY 1997, 21% (95) were referred to the criminal justice system within the first year after release, 17% (74) were referred during the second year after release, and 9% (40) were referred during the third year after

release.

- Approximately 62% of the youths with criminal justice referrals had also been re-referred to the juvenile justice system at least once.

Juvenile and Criminal Justice Recidivism Combined

- Of the total 445 youths, 78% (345) have had subsequent contact with either the juvenile justice system, the criminal justice system or both.
- About 49% (217) have been either re-adjudicated delinquent, convicted as adults, or both.
- About 34% (150) have been either re-committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice, incarcerated as adults, or both.
- Of the total 445 youths, 61% (271) were referred to either the juvenile justice system or the criminal justice system within one year after release, 13% (57) during the second year after release, and 4% (17) during the third year after release.
- Of the 445 youths, 22% (100) have not reappeared in either Maryland's juvenile or criminal justice systems within three years after release.

Using the nine recidivism measures, Table 17 shows the subsequent juvenile or criminal involvement of 445 youths during the three-year period. For example, in Table 17 under the re-referred row, the numbers 222, 259, 266 represent the number of youths who were re-referred to DJJ intake within one, two, and three years after release. Totals for other rows, such as re-adjudication, re-commitment, criminal referral, conviction, incarceration, juvenile and criminal justice referral, adjudication/conviction and commitment/incarceration are presented in the same manner, by adding the number of recidivists within one, two, and three years after release.

The majority (50%) were recidivists to the juvenile justice system within the first year after release, about 8% were re-referred during the second year after release and only 2% returned in the third year. However in the criminal justice system, youths were referred during one, two and three years, at the rate of 21%, 17% and 9%, respectively.

Table 17
Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 Within One, Two and Three Years After Release: Hickey Impact Program

Recidivism Measures	1 Year After Release	2 Years After Release	3 Years After Release
Re-referral - Juvenile	222 (50%)	259 (58%)	266 (60%)
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	112 (25%)	139 (31%)	149 (33%)
Re-commitment - Juvenile	77 (17%)	99 (22%)	105 (24%)
Criminal Referral	95 (21%)	169 (38%)	209 (47%)
Criminal Conviction	78 (18%)	143 (32%)	170 (38%)
Criminal Incarceration	54 (12%)	96 (22%)	110 (25%)
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	271 (61%)	328 (74%)	345 (78%)
Re-adjudication/Conviction	154 (35%)	198 (44%)	217 (49%)
Re-commitment/Incarceration	109 (24%)	140 (31%)	150 (34%)

Note: All percentages for Table 17 are calculated based on the total n=445

Table 18 indicates that the Hickey Impact Program's juvenile recidivism rates have been reduced according to all measures, which also reduced juvenile and adult combined recidivism rates for all three measures. Ongoing efforts to expand aftercare and improve programming services may further reduce the Hickey impact Program's recidivism rates.

The average cost per youth released from the Hickey Impact Program in 1997 was \$12,218. Given a 34% re-commitment/incarceration recidivism rate, the cost per non-recidivist youth was \$18,431.

Table 18
Comparison of Recidivism Rates Between Fiscal years 1994, 1995 & 1997
Hickey Impact Program

Recidivism Measures	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1997
Re-referral - Juvenile	57%	55%	60%
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	26%	29%	33%
Re-commitment - Juvenile	19%	17%	24%
Criminal Referral	46%	56%	47%
Criminal Conviction	34%	49%	38%
Criminal Incarceration	23%	36%	25%
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	78%	79%	78%
Re-adjudication/Conviction	55%	51%	49%
Re-commitment/Incarceration	37%	34%	34%

Table 19 compares the characteristics of juvenile offenders, who returned to the Department to those who did not return. Focusing on the differences between recidivists and non-recidivists, these data indicate that youths from Baltimore City (39%), Baltimore (12%), Montgomery (11%), and Prince George's (9%) Counties are more likely than others to re-offend, as are those who enter the juvenile justice system at younger ages. The data also indicate that the recidivists on an average entered the system as early as 12.8 years and were 1.3 years younger than the non-recidivists at the time of their FY 1997 admission to the Hickey Impact Program. The average age of recidivists at the time of their fiscal year 1997 admission was 15.6, while the average age of non-recidivists was 16.9. The average age at the time of release was 16.2 for the recidivists and 17.3 for the non-recidivists. This shows that the non-recidivists were nearing their upper juvenile age limit 18, at the time of their fiscal year 1997 release and had fewer chances to return to the juvenile justice system.

Table 19
Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System
Youths Released from Hickey impact Program in FY 1997

Population Characteristics	Recidivists	Non-recidivists	Total
Race			
African-American	71%	62%	66%
Caucasian	24%	30%	27%
Hispanic	4%	3%	4%
Other Race Groups	1%	4%	3%
County of Residence			
Allegany	0.4%	1.7%	0.9%
Anne Arundel	7.9%	10.1%	8.8%
Baltimore County	11.7%	8.4%	10.3%
Calvert	0.0%	0.6%	0.2%
Caroline	1.5%	0.0%	0.9%
Carroll	0.8%	0.6%	0.7%
Cecil	0.4%	1.1%	0.7%
Charles	3.0%	3.4%	3.1%
Dorchester	0.8%	0.6%	0.7%
Frederick	3.0%	3.4%	3.1%
Garrett	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%
Harford	3.8%	2.8%	3.4%
Howard	2.3%	1.1%	1.8%
Kent	0.0%	0.0%	0.2%
Montgomery	10.5%	18.0%	13.5%
Prince George's	8.6%	11.8%	10.1%
Queen Anne's	0.8%	1.7%	1.1%
St. Mary's	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%
Somerset	0.4%	0.0%	0.2%
Talbot	0.4%	1.1%	0.7%
Washington	0.4%	2.8%	1.3%
Wicomico	1.1%	0.6%	0.9%
Worcester	0.0%	0.6%	0.2%
Baltimore City	38.7%	21.9%	31.9%
Out of State	1.9%	5.6%	3.1%
Average age at first complaint	12.8	13.8	13.2
Average age at admission	15.6	16.9	16.2
Average age at release	16.2	17.3	16.7
Average # felony referrals	2.6	2.5	2.6
Average # misdemeanor referrals	4.1	4.0	4.0

4. Victor Cullen Academy

The Victor Cullen Academy is owned by the Department and like the Hickey School, is operated by Youth Services International. This program handles serious, chronic and violent juvenile male offenders, youths generally slightly less dangerous than those placed at the Hickey Enhanced Program and not requiring the intensive special education services provided at the O' Farrell Center. With most of the program housed within a secure fence, Victor Cullen typically serves youths somewhat more likely to flee than those placed at the youth centers. Victor Cullen does not accept youths adjudicated for murder, arson or sex offenses. The average length of stay was 8.4 months. In fiscal year 1997, 353 youths were released from the Victor Cullen Academy.

Population Characteristics

- The youths averaged 17.0 years of age at the time of their release; 12.8 years of age at the time of their first referral to the Department; and they had an average of 9.1 referrals when placed in one of the programs under study.
- The average number of felony and misdemeanor referrals were 4.4 and 4.7. The average number of violent referrals was 0.4.
- Almost 98% of the youths had at least one prior delinquency adjudication and the average age at the time of first adjudication was 14.4.
- 99% had been detained prior to their placement and the average age at the time of first detention was 14.8.
- 76% had at least one prior residential placement and the average age at the time of first admission was 15.3.
- 72% had been placed on probation at least once and the average age at the time of first complaint which led to probation was 14.4.
- About 84% of the youths were African-American; 12% were Caucasian; 2% were Hispanic; and 2% were Asian, Native-American or biracial.
- The 353 youths' most serious adjudicated offenses were: felonious assault and robbery with a deadly weapon (48%), narcotics felony (30%), auto theft (11%) and violent person-to-person felony (5%).

Table 20
The Most Serious Adjudicated Offenses of Youths Released from
Victor Cullen in FY 1997

Offense Type	Number of Youths	% of Youths
Violent Person-to-Person Felony	18	5%
Felonious Assault & Robbery with a Deadly Weapon	169	48%
Narcotics Felony (Distribution)	105	30%
Auto Theft	37	11%
Serious Property Felony	9	3%
Other Felony Offense	2	1%
Handgun Violation	3	1%
Type I Misdemeanor	10	3%
Narcotics Misdemeanor (Possession)	0	0%
Type II Misdemeanor	0	0%

Juvenile Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 353 youths released in FY 1997, 52% or 185 youths were re-referred to the Department; 21% (75) were re-adjudicated delinquent; and 16% (58) were re-committed to the Department's custody within three years after release.
- Of the total 353 youths released in FY 1997, 48% (168 youths) were re-referred during the first year after release, 5% (17 youths) were re-referred during the second year after release, and none was re-referred during the third year after release.

Criminal Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 353 youths released in FY 1997, 60% (212) were referred to the criminal justice system at least once; 52% (184) were convicted of a criminal offense; and 37% (130) were incarcerated within three years after release.
- Of the total 353 youths released in FY 1997, 35% (122) were referred to the criminal justice system within the first year after release, 17% (59) were referred during the second year after release, and 9% (31) were referred during the third year after release.

- Approximately 52% of the youths with criminal justice referrals had also been re-referred to the juvenile justice system at least once.

Juvenile and Criminal Justice Recidivism Combined

- Of the total 353 youths, 81% (286) have had subsequent contact with either the juvenile justice system, the criminal justice system or both.
- About 47% (167) have been either re-adjudicated delinquent, convicted as adults, or both.
- About 35% (124) have been either re-committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice, incarcerated as adults, or both.
- Of the total 353 youths, 67% (236) were referred to either the juvenile justice system or the criminal justice system within one year after release, 12% (41) during the second year after release, and 3% (9) during the third year after release.
- Of the 353 youths, 19% (67) have not reappeared in either Maryland's juvenile or criminal justice systems within three years after release.

Using the nine recidivism measures, Table 21 shows the subsequent juvenile or criminal involvement of 353 youths during the three-year period. For example, in Table 21 under the re-referred row, the numbers 168, 185 and 185 represent the number of youths who were re-referred to DJJ intake within one, two, and three years after release. Totals for other rows, such as re-adjudication, re-commitment, criminal referral, conviction, incarceration, juvenile and criminal justice referral, adjudication/conviction and commitment/incarceration are presented in the same manner, by adding the number of recidivists within one, two, and three years after release.

The majority of youths (48%) returned to the juvenile justice system within the first year after release, about 5% within two years after release and none returned in the third year. However, in the criminal justice system although the majority (35%) were referred within the first year after release from the juvenile justice system, and 17% and 9% were referred during the second and third years, respectively.

Table 21
Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 Within One, Two and Three
Years After Release: Victor Cullen

Recidivism Measures	1 Year After Release	2 Years After Release	3 Years After Release
Re-referral - Juvenile	168 (48%)	185 (52%)	185 (52%)
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	59 (17%)	74 (21%)	75 (21%)
Re-commitment - Juvenile	45 (13%)	58 (16%)	58 (16%)
Criminal Referral	122 (35%)	181 (51%)	212 (60%)
Criminal Conviction	101 (29%)	164 (46%)	184 (52%)
Criminal Incarceration	63 (18%)	110 (31%)	130 (37%)
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	236 (67%)	277 (78%)	286 (81%)
Re-adjudication/Conviction	121 (34%)	161 (46%)	167 (47%)
Re-commitment/Incarceration	83 (24%)	119 (34%)	124 (35%)

Note: All percentages for Table 21 are calculated based on the total N = 353

Table 22 data indicate that Victor Cullen's recidivism rates have been reduced according to all measures from FY 1994 and remained about the same from 1995. This may be due to the ongoing efforts to expand aftercare and improve programming services.

The average cost per youth released from the Victor Cullen in 1997 was \$32,465. Given a 35% re-commitment/incarceration recidivism rate, the cost per non-recidivist youth was \$50,044.

Table 22
Comparison of Recidivism Rates Between Fiscal years 1994, 1995 & 1997
Victor Cullen

Recidivism Measures	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1997
Re-referral - Juvenile	58%	53%	52%
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	21%	22%	21%
Re-commitment - Juvenile	11%	13%	16%
Criminal Referral	70%	69%	60%
Criminal Conviction	53%	64%	52%
Criminal Incarceration	44%	51%	37%
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	88%	84%	81%
Re-adjudication/Conviction	68%	50%	47%
Re-commitment/Incarceration	52%	36%	35%

Table 23 compares the characteristics of juvenile offenders, who returned to the Department to those who did not return. Focusing on the differences between recidivists and non-recidivists, these data indicate that African-Americans and Baltimore City (58%) youths are more likely than others to re-offend, as are those who enter the juvenile justice system at younger ages. The data also indicate that the recidivists on an average entered the system as early as 12.3 years and were 1.3 years younger than the non-recidivists at the time of their FY 1997 admission to Victor Cullen. The average age of recidivists at the time of their fiscal year 1997 admission was 15.7, while the average age of non-recidivists was 17.0. The average age at the time of release was 16.5 for the recidivists and 17.7 for the non-recidivists. This shows that the non-recidivists were already nearing their upper juvenile age limit 18, at the time of their fiscal year 1997 release and were there for less likely to return to the juvenile justice system.

Table 23
Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System
Youths Released from Victor Cullen in FY 1997

Population Characteristics	Recidivists	Non-recidivists	Total
Race			
African-American	87%	80%	84%
Caucasian	11%	14%	12%
Hispanic	2%	2%	2%
Other Race Groups	1%	4%	2%
County of Residence			
Allegany	0.5%	1.2%	1.0%
Anne Arundel	1.1%	3.6%	2.3%
Baltimore County	12.3%	11.4%	11.9%
Cecil	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%
Charles	0.5%	1.2%	0.8%
Dorchester	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%
Frederick	2.7%	0.0%	1.4%
Garrett	0.5%	0.0%	0.3%
Harford	1.1%	0.6%	0.8%
Howard	0.5%	0.0%	0.3%
Kent	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%
Montgomery	6.4%	11.4%	8.5%
Prince George's	10.7%	14.5%	12.5%
Somerset	0.5%	0.0%	0.3%
Talbot	0.0%	1.2%	0.6%
Washington	1.6%	1.8%	1.7%
Wicomico	1.1%	0.6%	0.8%
Worcester	0.0%	0.6%	0.3%
Baltimore City	58.3%	46.4%	53.0%
Out of State	1.6%	3.6%	2.5%
Average age at first complaint	12.3	13.4	12.8
Average age at admission	15.7	17.0	16.3
Average age at release	16.5	17.7	17.0
Average # felony referrals	4.6	4.2	4.4
Average # misdemeanor referrals	5.2	4.2	4.7

5. Thomas J. O'Farrell Youth Center

The Thomas J. O'Farrell Youth Center is owned by the Department and operated by the North American Family Institute, a private, nonprofit youth services corporation. This 38-bed program handles serious, chronic and violent male juvenile offenders. However, this staff-secure program generally handles less dangerous offenders than those placed in the Hickey Enhanced program. The O'Farrell Center does not accept youths adjudicated for sex offenses or arson and rarely accepts those having long histories of serious violent behavior. With particular success in serving youths with high-intensity special education needs, this 8 to 10-month program focuses heavily on educational achievement, skills development and community service.

In fiscal year 1997, 49 youths were released from the O'Farrell Youth Center, with an average length of stay of 10.3 months. The population characteristics and recidivism rates were:

Population Characteristics

- The youths averaged 16.7 years at the time of release; 12.7 years of age at the time of their first referral to the Department of Juvenile Justice; and they had an average of 8.0 referrals when placed in one of the programs under study.
- The average number of felony and misdemeanor referrals was 3.3 and 4.7. The average number of violent referrals was 0.3.
- Almost 100% of the youths had at least one prior delinquency adjudication, and the average age at the time of first adjudication was 14.2.
- 98% had been detained prior to their placement and the average age at the time of first detention was 14.4.
- 71% had at least one prior residential placement and the average age at the time of first admission was 14.9.
- 55% had been placed on probation at least once and the average age at the time of first complaint which led to probation was 14.0.
- About 61% of the youths were African-American; 33% were Caucasian; and 6% were Hispanic.
- The 49 youths' most serious adjudicated offenses were felonious assault and robbery with a deadly weapon serious property felony (37%), serious property felony (14%), Type I misdemeanors (14%), auto theft (12%), violent person-to-person felony (12%), and narcotics felony (10%).

Table 24
The Most Serious Adjudicated Offenses of Youths Released from
O'Farrell Program in FY 1997

Offense Type	Number of Youths	% of Youths
Violent Person-to-Person Felony	6	12%
Felonious Assault & Robbery with a Deadly weapon	18	37%
Narcotics Felony (Distribution)	5	10%
Auto Theft	6	12%
Serious Property Felony	7	14%
Other Felony Offense	0	0%
Handgun Violation	0	0%
Type I Misdemeanor	7	14%
Narcotics Misdemeanor (Possession)	0	0%
Type II Misdemeanor	0	0%

Juvenile Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 49 youths released in FY 1997, 59% or 29 youths were re-referred to the Department; 18% (9) were re-adjudicated delinquent; and 12% (6) were re-committed to the Department's custody within three years after release.
- Of the total 49 youths released in FY 1997, 47% (23 youths) were re-referred during the first year after release, 12% (6 youths) were re-referred during the second year after release, and none was re-referred during the third year after release.

Criminal Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 49 youths released in FY 1997, 49% (24) were referred to the criminal justice system at least once; 37% (18) were convicted of a criminal offense; and 24% (12) were incarcerated.
- Of the total 49 youths released in FY 1997, 16% (8) were referred to the criminal justice system within the first year after release, 18% (9) were referred during the second year after release, and 14% (7) were referred during the third year after release.

- Approximately 58% of the youths with criminal justice referrals had also been re-referred to the juvenile justice system at least once.

Juvenile and Criminal Justice Recidivism Combined

- Of the total 49 youths, 80% (39) have had subsequent contact with either the juvenile justice system, the criminal justice system, or both.
- About 35% (17) have been either re-adjudicated delinquent, convicted as adults, or both.
- About 22% (11) have been either re-committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice, incarcerated as adults, or both.
- Of the total 49 youths, 57% (28) were referred to either the juvenile justice system or the criminal justice system within one year after release, 16% (8) during the second year after release, and 6% (3) were referred during the third year after release.
- Of the 49 youths, 20% (10) have not reappeared in either Maryland's juvenile or criminal justice systems within three years after release.

Using the nine recidivism measures, Table 25 shows the subsequent juvenile or criminal involvement of 49 youths during the three-year period. For example, in Table 25 under the re-referred row, the numbers 23, 29 and 29 represent the number of youths who were re-referred to DJJ intake within one, two, and three years after release. Totals for other rows, such as re-adjudication, re-commitment, criminal referral, conviction, incarceration, juvenile and criminal justice referral, adjudication/conviction and commitment/incarceration are presented in the same manner, by adding the number of recidivists within one, two, and three years after release.

The majority of youths (47%) returned to the juvenile justice system within the first year after release; and about 12% in the second year and none in the third year. However, in the criminal justice system youths were returned proportionately during the first, second and third years after release.

Table 25
Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 Within One, Two and Three Years
After Release: O'Farrell Program

Recidivism Measures	1 Year After Release	2 Years After Release	3 Years After Release
Re-referral - Juvenile	23 (47%)	29 (59%)	29 (59%)
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	7 (14%)	9 (18%)	9 (18%)
Re-commitment - Juvenile	5 (10%)	6 (12%)	6 (12%)
Criminal Referral	8 (16%)	17 (35%)	24 (49%)
Criminal Conviction	7 (14%)	14 (29%)	18 (37%)
Criminal Incarceration	5 (10%)	11 (22%)	12 (24%)
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	28 (57%)	36 (73%)	39 (80%)
Re-adjudication/Conviction	12 (24%)	15 (31%)	17 (35%)
Re-commitment/Incarceration	9 (18%)	11 (22%)	11 (22%)

Note: All percentages for Table 25 are calculated based on the total n = 49

Table 26 data indicate that O'Farrell Program's recidivism rates have been reduced according to all measures. Ongoing efforts to expand aftercare and improve programming services should reduce the O'Farrell Program's recidivism rates.

The average cost per youth released from the O'Farrell Program in 1997 was \$50,937. Given a 22% re-commitment/incarceration recidivism rate, the cost per non-recidivist youth was \$65,682.

Table 26
Comparison of Recidivism Rates Between Fiscal years 1994, 1995 & 1997
O' Farrell Program

Recidivism Measures	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1997
Re-referral - Juvenile	55%	46%	59%
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	24%	27%	18%
Re-commitment - Juvenile	10%	10%	12%
Criminal Referral	57%	63%	49%
Criminal Conviction	43%	51%	37%
Criminal Incarceration	33%	41%	24%
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	81%	73%	80%
Re-adjudication/Conviction	60%	51%	35%
Re-commitment/Incarceration	38%	32%	22%

Table 27 compares the characteristics of juvenile offenders, who returned to the Department to those who did not return. Focusing on the differences between recidivists and non-recidivists, these data indicate that youths from Baltimore City (38%), Prince George's (21%), Montgomery (10%) and St. Mary's (10%) Counties are more likely than others to re-offend, as are those who enter the juvenile justice system at younger ages. The data also indicate that the recidivists on an average enter the system as early as 11.9 years and are a year younger than the non-recidivists at the time of their FY 1997 admission to the O'Farrell program. The average age of recidivists at the time of their fiscal year 1997 admission was 15.4, while the average age of non-recidivists was 16.4. The average age at the time of release was 16.3 for the recidivists and 17.4 for the non-recidivists. This shows that the non-recidivists were already nearing their upper juvenile age limit 18, at the time of their fiscal year 1997 release and were less likely to have returned to the juvenile justice system.

Table 27
Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System
Youths Released from O' Farrell Program in FY 1997

Population Characteristics	Recidivists	Non-recidivists	Total
Race			
African-American	59%	65%	61%
Caucasian	35%	30%	33%
Hispanic	7%	5%	6%
Other Race Groups	0%	0%	0%
County of Residence			
Baltimore County	3.4%	5.0%	4.1%
Calvert	3.4%	0.0%	2.0%
Cecil	0.0%	5.0%	2.0%
Charles	0.0%	10.0%	4.1%
Frederick	3.4%	0.0%	2.0%
Howard	6.9%	0.0%	4.1%
Kent	3.4%	0.0%	2.0%
Montgomery	10.3%	20.0%	14.3%
Prince George's	20.7%	40.0%	28.6%
St. Mary's	10.3%	0.0%	6.1%
Baltimore City	37.9%	20.0%	30.6%
Average age at first complaint	11.9	13.9	12.7
Average age at admission	15.4	16.4	15.8
Average age at release	16.3	17.4	16.7
Average # felony referrals	3.7	2.9	3.3
Average # misdemeanor referrals	5.0	4.2	4.7

6. Young Women's Facility at Cheltenham

The Cheltenham Youth Facility, where the young women's program is housed, is the Department's oldest and largest juvenile justice complex. Although the campus' primary function is currently to provide secure detention for male youths awaiting juvenile court hearings and/or placements at committed programs, the campus also houses a 28-bed program for serious, chronic and violent female offenders. Although these young women may pose serious public safety risks, they generally do not have very long offense histories, indicating that young female offenders tend to be placed in the Department's custody more quickly than do their male counterparts. This nationally acclaimed program includes gender-specific programming, substance abuse treatment and rehabilitative care.

In fiscal year 1997, 39 youths were released from the Young Women's Facility, with an average length of stay of 8.4 months. The population characteristics and recidivism rates were:

Population Characteristics

- The youths averaged 17 years at the time of release; 14.1 years of age at the time of their first referral to the Department of Juvenile Justice; and they had an average of 5 referrals when placed in one of the programs under study.
- The average number of felony and misdemeanor referrals were 1.5 and 3.5. The average number of violent referrals was 0.3.
- About 97% of the youths had at least one prior delinquency adjudication and the average age at the time of first adjudication was 14.7.
- 97% had been detained prior to their placement and the average age at the time of first detention was 14.8.
- 64% had at least one prior residential placement and the average age at the time of first admission was 15.4.
- 46% had been placed on probation at least once and the average age at the time of first complaint which led to probation was 14.6.
- About 51% of the youths were African-American; 46% were Caucasian; and 3% were other race groups.
- The 39 youths' most serious adjudicated offenses were: felonious assault and robbery with a deadly weapon (28%), Type I Misdemeanors (23%), serious property felony (21%), and violent person-to-person (13%).

Table 28
The Most Serious Adjudicated Offense of Youths Released from
Cheltenham Young Women's Program in FY 1997

Offense Type	Number of Youths	% of Youths
Violent Person-to-Person Felony	5	13%
Felonious Assault & Robbery with a Deadly Weapon	11	28%
Narcotics Felony (Distribution)	0	0%
Auto Theft	5	13%
Serious Property Felony	8	21%
Other Felony Offense	1	3%
Handgun Violation	0	0%
Type I Misdemeanor	9	23%
Narcotics Misdemeanor (Possession)	0	0%
Type II Misdemeanor	0	0%

Juvenile Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 39 youths released in FY 1997, 33% or 13 youths were re-referred to the Department; 5% (2) were re-adjudicated delinquent; and 3% (1) were re-committed to the Department's custody.
- Of the total 39 youths released in FY 1997, 28% (11 youths) were re-referred during the first year after release, 5% (2 youths) were re-referred during the second year after release, and none was re-referred during the third year after release.

Criminal Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 39 youths released in FY 1997, 33% (13) were referred to the criminal justice system at least once; 23% (9) were convicted of a criminal offense; and 13% (5) were incarcerated.
- Of the total 39 youths released in FY 1997, 13% (5 youths) were referred to the criminal justice system within the first year after release, 8% (3 youths) were referred during the second year after release, and 13% (5 youths) were referred during the third year after release.

- Approximately 54% of the youths with criminal justice referrals had also been re-referred to the juvenile justice system at least once.

Juvenile and Criminal Justice Recidivism Combined

- Of the total 39 youths, 49% (19) have had subsequent contact with either the juvenile justice system, the criminal justice system or both within three years after release.
- About 18% (7) have been either re-adjudicated delinquent, convicted as adults, or both.
- About 8% (3) have been either re-committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice, incarcerated as adults, or both.
- Of the total 39 youths, 33% (13) were referred to either the juvenile justice system or the criminal justice system within one year after release, 8% (3) during the second year after release, and 8% (3) during the third year after release.
- Of the 39 youths, 51% (20) have not reappeared in either Maryland's juvenile or criminal justice systems within three years after release.

Using the nine recidivism measures, the following Table 29 shows the subsequent juvenile or criminal involvement of 39 youths during the three-year period. For example, in Table 29 under the re-referred row, the numbers 11, 13 and 13 represent the number of youths who were re-referred to DJJ intake within one, two, and three years after release.

Totals for other rows, such as re-adjudication, re-commitment, criminal referral, conviction, incarceration, juvenile and criminal justice referral, adjudication/conviction and commitment/incarceration are presented in the same manner, by adding the number of recidivists within one, two, and three years after release.

The majority of youths reentered the juvenile justice system within the first two years after release and only four youths returned in the third year. However, in the criminal justice system more number of youths were referred during the second and third years after release from the juvenile justice system than during the first year.

Table 29
Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 Within One, Two and Three Years
After Release: Cheltenham Young Women's Program

Recidivism Measures	1 Year After Release	2 Years After Release	3 Years After Release
Re-referral - Juvenile	11 (28%)	13 (33%)	13 (33%)
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	1 (3%)	2 (5%)	2 (5%)
Re-commitment - Juvenile	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
Criminal Referral	5 (13%)	8 (21%)	13 (33%)
Criminal Conviction	5 (13%)	7 (18%)	9 (23%)
Criminal Incarceration	4 (10%)	5 (13%)	5 (13%)
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	13 (33%)	16 (41%)	19 (49%)
Re-adjudication/Conviction	3 (8%)	5 (13%)	7 (18%)
Re-commitment/Incarceration	3 (8%)	3 (8%)	3 (8%)

Note: All percentages for Table 29 are calculated based on the total n = 39

The following Table 30 data indicate that Young Women's Program's recidivism rates were the lowest of all the eight programs studied. Ongoing efforts to expand aftercare and improve programming services should further reduce the Young Women's recidivism rates.

The average cost per youth released from the Cheltenham Young Women's Program in 1997 was \$43,969. Given an 8% re-commitment/incarceration recidivism rate, the cost per non-recidivist youth was \$47,633.

Table 30
Comparison of Recidivism Rates Between Fiscal Years 1994, 1995 & 1997
Cheltenham Young Women's Program

Recidivism Measures	FY 1994	FY 1995	FY 1997
Re-referral - Juvenile	28%	36%	33%
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	9%	13%	5%
Re-commitment - Juvenile	5%	6%	3%
Criminal Referral	40%	23%	33%
Criminal Conviction	30%	17%	23%
Criminal Incarceration	16%	13%	13%
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	53%	55%	49%
Re-adjudication/Conviction	37%	28%	18%
Re-commitment/Incarceration	21%	17%	8%

Table 31 compares the characteristics of juvenile offenders, who returned to the Department to those who did not return. Focusing on the differences between recidivists and non-recidivists, these data indicate that youths from Montgomery (23%), Prince George's (23%), Anne Arundel (15%) Howard(15%), Baltimore (8%), and Cecil (8%) Counties and Baltimore City (7%) are more likely than others to re-offend, as are those who enter the juvenile justice system at younger ages. The data also indicate that the recidivists on an average enter the system as early as 13.8 years and are 1 year younger than the non-recidivists at the time of their admission to Cheltenham Young Women's facility. The average age of recidivists at the time of their fiscal year 1997 admission was 15.4, while the average age of non-recidivists was 16.4. The average age at the time of release was 16.4 for the recidivists and 17.2 for the non-recidivists. This shows that at the time of their fiscal year 1997 release, the non-recidivists had less than a year to return to the juvenile justice system.

Table 31
Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System
Youths Released from Cheltenham Young Women's Program in FY 1997

Population Characteristics	Recidivists	Non-recidivists	Total
Race			
African-American	62%	46%	51%
Caucasian	39%	50%	46%
Hispanic	0%	0%	0%
Other Race Groups	0%	4%	3%
County of Residence			
Anne Arundel	15.4%	3.8%	7.7%
Baltimore County	7.7%	7.7%	7.7%
Cecil	7.7%	0.0%	2.6%
Charles	0.0%	7.7%	5.1%
Frederick	0.0%	3.8%	2.6%
Howard	15.4%	0.0%	5.1%
Montgomery	23.1%	19.2%	20.5%
Prince George's	23.1%	26.9%	25.6%
Queen Anne's	0.0%	3.8%	2.6%
St. Mary's	0.0%	3.8%	2.6%
Washington	0.0%	3.8%	2.6%
Baltimore City	7.7%	7.7%	7.7%
Out of State	0.0%	7.7%	5.1%
Average age at first complaint	13.8	14.3	14.1
Average age at admission	15.4	16.4	16.0
Average age at release	16.4	17.2	17.0
Average # felony referrals	2.0	1.3	1.5
Average # misdemeanor referrals	4.1	3.1	3.5

7. Good Shepherd Residential Treatment Center

Good Shepherd is a Residential Treatment Center licensed by the Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. The Good Shepherd program is open to females between the ages of 12 to 21 who are experiencing social, emotional or behavioral difficulties that impair their ability to function successfully at home. The facility has its own in-house education which provides special education services through Level VI. The length of stay of youths in this program was 13 months. The program has 105 licensed beds.

The Good Shepherd Center released 50 DJJ youths in fiscal year 1997, with an average length of stay of 12.3 months. The population characteristics and recidivism rates of these youths are as follows:

Population Characteristics

- The youths averaged 16.6 years at the time of release; 13.8 years of age at the time of their first referral to the Department of Juvenile Justice; and they had an average of 4.9 referrals when placed in one of the programs under study.
- The average number of felony and misdemeanor referrals were 1.0 and 3.9. The average number of violent referrals was 0.1.
- About 94% of the youths had at least one prior delinquency adjudication and the average age at the time of first adjudication was 14.5.
- 92% had been detained prior to their placement and the average age at the time of first detention was 14.6.
- 42% had at least one prior residential placement and the average age at the time of first admission was 15.2.
- 54% had been placed on probation at least once and the average age at the time of first complaint which led to probation was 14.3.
- About 40% of the youths were African-American and 60% were Caucasian.
- The 50 youths' most serious adjudicated offenses were Type I misdemeanors (60%), felonious assault and robbery with a deadly weapon (12%) and auto theft (12%).

Table 32
The Most Serious Adjudicated Offense for Youths Released from
Good Shepherd Residential Treatment Center in FY 1997

Offense Type	Number of Youths	% of Youths
Violent Person-to-Person Felony	2	4%
Felonious Assault & Robbery with a Deadly Weapon	6	12%
Narcotics Felony (Distribution)	0	0%
Auto Theft	6	12%
Serious Property Felony	2	4%
Other Felony Offense	0	0%
Handgun Violation	0	0%
Type I Misdemeanor	30	60%
Narcotics Misdemeanor (Possession)	2	4%
Type II Misdemeanor	2	4%

Juvenile Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 50 youths released in FY 1997, 36% or 18 youths were re-referred to the Department; 12% (6) were re-adjudicated delinquent; and 8% (4) were re-committed to the Department's custody.
- Of the total 50 youths released in FY 1997, 20% (10 youths) were re-referred during the first year after release, 16% (8 youths) were re-referred during the second year after release, and none was re-referred during the third year after release.

Criminal Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 50 youths released in FY 1997, 14% or 7 youths were referred to the criminal justice system at least once; 8% (4) were convicted of a criminal offense; and 8% (4) were incarcerated.
- Of the total 50 youths released in FY 1997, 6% (3 youths) were referred to the criminal justice system within the first year after release, 4% (2) were referred during the second year after release, and 4% (2) were referred during the third year after release.

- Approximately 43% of the youths with criminal justice referrals had also been re-referred to the juvenile justice system at least once.

Juvenile and Criminal Justice Recidivism Combined

- Of the total 50 youths, 44% (22) have had subsequent contact with either the juvenile justice system, the criminal justice system or both.
- About 14% (7) have been either re-adjudicated delinquent, convicted as adults, or both.
- About 10% (5) have been either re-committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice, incarcerated as adults, or both.
- Of the total 50 youths, 22% (11) were referred to either the juvenile justice system or the criminal justice system within one year after release, 18% (9) during the second year after release, and 4% (2) during the third year after release.
- Of the 50 youths, 56% (28) have not reappeared in either Maryland's juvenile or criminal justice systems within three years after release.

Using the nine recidivism measures, Table 33 shows the subsequent juvenile or criminal involvement of 50 youths during the three-year period. For example, in Table 33 under the re-referred row, the numbers 10, 18 and 18 represent the number of youths who were re-referred to DJJ intake within one, two, and three years after release. Totals for other rows, such as re-adjudication, re-commitment, criminal referral, conviction, incarceration, juvenile and criminal justice referral, adjudication/conviction and commitment/incarceration are presented in the same manner, by adding the number of recidivists within one, two, and three years after release.

All re-referrals to the juvenile justice system occurred within the first two years after release and none returned in the third year. However, in the criminal justice system youths were referred during all three years after release. Three were referred within the first year after release and two youths in the second year and another 2 youths in the third year after release.

Table 33
Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 Within One, Two and Three
Years After Release: Good Shepherd Residential Treatment Center

Recidivism Measures	1 Year After Release	2 Years After Release	3 Years After Release
Re-referral - Juvenile	10 (20%)	18 (36%)	18 (36%)
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	3 (6%)	5 (10%)	6 (12%)
Re-commitment - Juvenile	3 (6%)	4 (8%)	4 (8%)
Criminal Referral	3 (6%)	5 (10%)	7 (14%)
Criminal Conviction	3 (6%)	4 (8%)	4 (8%)
Criminal Incarceration	2 (4%)	4 (8%)	4 (8%)
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	11 (22%)	20 (40%)	22 (44%)
Re-adjudication/Conviction	4 (8%)	6 (12%)	7 (14%)
Re-commitment/Incarceration	4 (8%)	5 (10%)	5 (10%)

Note: All percentages for Table 33 are calculated based on the total n = 50

Good Shepherd Program youths recidivism rates were the second lowest of all the eight programs studied. The combined re-commitment/incarceration rate was only 10%.

The average cost per youth released from Good Shepherd Center in 1997 was \$83,213. Given a 10% re-commitment/incarceration recidivism rate, the cost per non-recidivist youth was \$90,000.

Table 34
Comparison of Recidivism Rates between Fiscal Years 1995 and 1997
Good Shepherd Residential Treatment Center

	FY 1995	FY 1997
Re-referral - Juvenile	44%	36%
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	10%	12%
Re-commitment - Juvenile	5%	8%
Criminal Referral	15%	14%
Criminal Conviction	13%	8%
Criminal Incarceration	8%	8%
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	49%	44%
Re-adjudication/Conviction	13%	14%
Re-commitment/Incarceration	8%	5%

Table 35 compares the characteristics of juvenile offenders, who returned to the Department to those who did not return. Focusing on the differences between recidivists and non-recidivists, these data indicate that Caucasians, and youths from Montgomery (22%), Prince George's (17%), Baltimore (11%), and Talbot (11%) Counties are more likely than others to re-offend, as are those who enter the juvenile justice system at younger ages. The data also indicate that the recidivists on an average entered the system as early as 13.5 years and are a year younger than the non-recidivists. The average age of recidivists at the time of their fiscal year 1997 admission was 14.9, while the average age of non-recidivists was 15.9. The average age at the time of release was 16.0 for the recidivists and 16.9 for the non-recidivists. This shows that the non-recidivists were there for a little over a year in the juvenile justice system at the time of their fiscal year 1997 release.

Table 35
Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System
Youths Released from Good Shepherd Residential Treatment Center in FY 1997

Population Characteristics	Recidivists	Non-recidivists	Total
Race			
African-American	28%	47%	40%
Caucasian	72%	53%	60%
Hispanic	0%	0%	0%
Other Race Groups	0%	0%	0%
County of Residence			
Anne Arundel	5.6%	6.3%	6.0%
Baltimore County	11.1%	3.1%	6.0%
Calvert	5.6%	12.5%	10.0%
Cecil	5.6%	0.0%	2.0%
Charles	5.6%	3.1%	4.0%
Frederick	5.6%	3.1%	4.0%
Harford	0.0%	3.1%	2.0%
Howard	0.0%	3.1%	2.0%
Kent	5.6%	3.1%	4.0%
Montgomery	22.2%	21.9%	22.0%
Prince George's	16.7%	18.8%	18.0%
St. Mary's	0.0%	6.3%	4.0%
Somerset	5.6%	0.0%	2.0%
Talbot	11.1%	0.0%	4.0%
Washington	0.0%	3.1%	2.0%
Wicomico	0.0%	3.1%	2.0%
Baltimore City	0.0%	3.1%	2.0%
Out of State	0.0%	6.3%	4.0%
Average age at first complaint	13.5	14.0	13.8
Average age at admission	14.9	15.9	15.5
Average age at release	16.0	16.9	16.6
Average # felony referrals	1.0	1.0	1.0
Average # misdemeanor referrals	4.5	3.6	3.9

8. Group Homes

Group homes are long-term 24-hour programs offering a group living experience, counseling, supervision, and other services in a community-based setting. The age of youths in group homes varies based on the criteria set by each group homes. Group homes used by the Department are all licensed by some state agency such as Department of Human Resources (DHR), Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DHMH), Division of Drug Administration (DDA), and DJJ. Youth in group homes attend regular public schools, although a few group homes have their own schools. Youths in group homes comparatively have committed less serious offenses. Certain group homes have special focus to prepare youth for independent living. Some focus on emotionally disturbed youth, and some are alternatives for stay at home. Group homes range in size from 6 to 60 youths, although at any given time not all are DJJ youth and are being shared by other state agencies.

The group homes released 149 youths in fiscal year 1997. The average length of stay was 10.5 months.

Population Characteristics

- The youths averaged 16.7 years at the time of release; 12.8 years of age at the time of their first referral to the Department of Juvenile Justice; and they had an average of 6.7 referrals when placed in one of the programs under study.
- The average number of felony and misdemeanor referrals was 2.2 and 4.5. The average number of violent referrals was 0.3.
- About 95% of the youths had at least one prior delinquency adjudication and the average age at the time of first adjudication was 14.1.
- 92% had been detained prior to their placement and the average age at the time of first detention was 14.4.
- 71% had at least one prior residential placement and the average age at the time of first admission was 14.9.
- 57% had been placed on probation at least once and the average age at the time of first complaint which led to probation was 14.
- About 55% of the youths were African-American; 41% were Caucasian, 1% were Hispanic, and 3% were other race groups.
- The 149 youths' most serious adjudicated offenses were: felonious assault and robbery with a deadly weapon (27%), Type 1 misdemeanors (27%), narcotics felony (11%), person-to-person felony (11%), auto theft (10%), and serious property felony (9%).

Table 36
The Most Serious Adjudicated Offense of Youths Released from
Group Homes in FY 1997

Offense Type	Number of Youths	% of Youths
Violent Person-to-Person Felony	17	11%
Felonious Assault & Robbery with a Deadly weapon	40	27%
Narcotics Felony (Distribution)	17	11%
Auto Theft	15	10%
Serious Property Felony	13	9%
Other Felony Offense	2	1%
Handgun Violation	0	0%
Type I Misdemeanor	40	27%
Narcotics Misdemeanor (Possession)	0	0%
Type II Misdemeanor	5	3%

Juvenile Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 149 youths released in FY 1997, 40% (60 youths) were re-referred to the Department; 23% (34) were re-adjudicated delinquent; and 15% (22) were re-committed to the Department's custody.
- Of the total 149 youths released in FY 1997, 33% (49 youths) were re-referred during the first year after release, 5% (8 youths) were re-referred during the second year after release, and 2% (3 youths) were re-referred during the third year after release.

Criminal Justice Recidivism

- Of the total 149 youths released in FY 1997, 39% (58) were referred to the criminal justice system at least once; 27% (40) were convicted of a criminal offense; and 18% (27) were incarcerated.
- Of the total 149 youths released in FY 1997, 17% (25) were referred to the criminal justice system within the first year after release, 13% (20) were referred during the second year after release, and 9% (13) were referred during the third year after release.

- Approximately 36% of the youths with criminal justice referrals had also been re-referred to the juvenile justice system at least once.

Juvenile and Criminal Justice Recidivism Combined

- Of the total 149 youths, 65% (97) have had subsequent contact with either the juvenile justice system, the criminal justice system or both.
- About 40% (60) have been either re-adjudicated delinquent, convicted as adults, or both.
- About 26% (39) have been either re-committed to the Department of Juvenile Justice, incarcerated as adults, or both.
- Of the total 149 youths, 47% (70) were referred to either the juvenile justice system or the criminal justice system within one year after release, 13% (19) during the second year after release, and 5% (8) were referred during the third year after release.
- Of the 149 youths, 35% (52) have not reappeared in either Maryland's juvenile or criminal justice systems within three years after release.

Using the nine recidivism measures, Table 37 shows the subsequent juvenile or criminal involvement of 149 youths during the three-year period. For example, in Table 37 under the re-referred row, the numbers 49, 57 and 60 represent the number of youths who were re-referred to DJJ intake during the first, second and third years after release. Totals for other rows, such as re-adjudication, re-commitment, criminal referral, conviction, incarceration, juvenile and criminal justice referral, adjudication/conviction and commitment/incarceration are presented in the same manner, by adding the number of recidivists within one, two, and three years after release.

The majority of youths returned to the juvenile justice system within the first two years after release and none returned in the third year. However, in the criminal justice system youths were entering at consistent proportions during all three years.

Table 37
Recidivism Rates for Youths Released in Fiscal Year 1997 Within One, Two and Three Years After Release: Group Homes

Recidivism Measures	1 Year After Release	2 Years After Release	3 Years After Release
Re-referral - Juvenile	49 (33%)	57 (38%)	60 (40%)
Re-adjudication - Delinquent	21 (14%)	32 (21%)	34 (23%)
Re-commitment - Juvenile	13 (9%)	22 (15%)	22 (15%)
Criminal Referral	25 (15%)	45 (30%)	58 (39%)
Criminal Conviction	18 (12%)	34 (23%)	40 (27%)
Criminal Incarceration	15 (10%)	24 (16%)	27 (18%)
Re-referral - Juvenile/Criminal	70 (47%)	89 (60%)	97 (65%)
Re-adjudication/Conviction	37 (25%)	54 (36%)	60 (40%)
Re-commitment/Incarceration	26 (17%)	37 (25%)	39 (26%)

Note: All percentages for Table 37 are calculated based on the total n = 149

Youths released from group homes re-referred to DJJ at a lower level than other programs. The combined re-commitment/incarceration rate was 26%, which was equal lower than the recidivism rates for youths released from the major programs.

The fiscal year 1997 cost per youth released from group homes was about \$ 35,645. Given a 26% re-commitment/incarceration recidivism rate, the cost per non-recidivist youth was \$55,223.

Table 38 compares the characteristics of juvenile offenders, who returned to the Department to those who did not return. Focusing on the differences between recidivists and non-recidivists, these data indicate that mostly African-Americans, and youths from Baltimore City (28%) and Baltimore (12%), Washington (12%), Montgomery (8%), and Frederick (7%) Counties are more likely than others to re-offend, as are those who enter the juvenile justice system at younger ages. The data also indicate that the recidivists on an average entered the system as early as 11.6 years and were 1.7 years younger than the non-recidivists at the time of their FY 1997 admission to a group home. The average age of recidivists at the time of their fiscal year 1997 admission was 14.7, while the average age of non-recidivists was 16.4. The average age at the time of release

was 15.7 for the recidivists and 17.4 for the non-recidivists. This shows that the non-recidivists were already nearing their upper juvenile age limit 18, at the time of their fiscal year 1997 release and were less likely to have reentered the juvenile justice system.

Table 38
Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System
Youths Released from Group Homes in FY 1997

Population Characteristics	Recidivists	Non-recidivists	Total
Race			
African-American	63%	49%	55%
Caucasian	37%	44%	41%
Hispanic	0%	2%	1%
Other Race Groups	0%	5%	3%
County of Residence			
Allegany	1.7%	2.3%	2.0%
Anne Arundel	1.7%	10.2%	6.7%
Baltimore County	11.7%	9.1%	10.7%
Calvert	1.7%	2.3%	2.0%
Caroline	1.7%	2.3%	2.0%
Cecil	1.7%	1.1%	1.3%
Charles	5.0%	1.1%	2.7%
Dorchester	1.7%	0.0%	0.7%
Frederick	6.7%	4.5%	5.4%
Harford	3.3%	5.7%	4.7%
Howard	1.7%	0.0%	0.7%
Kent	0.0%	1.1%	0.7%
Montgomery	8.3%	11.4%	10.1%
Prince George's	1.7%	14.8%	9.4%
Queen Anne's	3.3%	1.1%	2.0%
St. Mary's	0.0%	1.1%	0.7%
Somerset	1.7%	0.0%	0.7%
Talbot	1.7%	0.0%	0.7%
Washington	11.7%	10.2%	10.7%
Wicomico	3.3%	0.0%	1.3%
Worcester	0.0%	2.3%	1.3%
Baltimore City	28.3%	17.0%	21.5%
Out of State	1.7%	2.3%	2.0%

Table 38 (continued)
Recidivists versus Non-recidivists in the Juvenile Justice System
Youths Released from Group Homes in FY 1997

Population Characteristics	Recidivists	Non-recidivists	Total
Average age at first complaint	11.6	13.6	12.8
Average age at admission	14.7	16.4	15.7
Average age at release	15.7	17.4	16.7
Average # felony referrals	2.5	2.0	2.2
Average # misdemeanor referrals	5.2	4.0	4.5

SUMMARY AND FOLLOW-UP PLANS

This study reveals that the majority of youths return to the juvenile justice system within one year after release and to the criminal justice system within two years after release. However, only 34% required subsequent residential placements in either system (see Table 2). The 1,735 youths studied in this report represent only 4% of the total number of intake youths (40,713) received by the Department in fiscal year 1997. Over half the Department's residential care budget is devoted to funding the selected public or privately operated residential programs. It should be noted that the majority (57%) of youths entering the juvenile justice system are one-time only offenders, who do not require residential care. This supports current Departmental efforts to increase sanctions for second and third-time juvenile offenders.

Additionally, it is the goal of the Department of Juvenile Justice to incorporate accountability measures, including recidivism into all contracts and grant applications. The Department's emphasis on recidivism research and program evaluation will result in future reports analyzing recidivism rates as youths progress through the juvenile justice system from intake to juvenile court probation, secure detention, and to committed residential programs.